

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

IN *Aspects of the Way*, by Mr. A. D. MARTIN, of which there is a notice in another column, not the least penetrating of the studies is that on 'His Cup.' In a single sentence our Lord once referred both to His cup and to His baptism. Both of the references are figurative; but the figures are such that they give us at least a glimpse into the mind of Jesus on His passion. 'The cup that I drink, ye shall drink; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized.'

It was to James and John that Jesus spoke these words. In their ignorance they had asked that they might share the Master's glory. In His veiled way the Master told them that they who would reign with Him must first drink His cup and be baptized with His baptism. Sobered perhaps, but undismayed, they said, 'We are able'; and Jesus, who knew better than they what their words meant, acknowledged that they were able.

At the Last Supper a little more light was given. 'He took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them; and they all drank of it.' The Cup was His blood of the covenant, shed for many. A little later, in Gethsemane, the two disciples were to learn yet more about His Cup; or rather the three disciples; for now Peter was with them, and Peter too had said, 'I am able': 'If I must die with thee, I will not deny thee.'

What was the Cup of Jesus? We have learned afresh—Wernle for one has been our teacher—how deep in Old Testament scripture were the roots of Jesus' piety and Jesus' thought of God. What does 'the cup' mean in the Old Testament? At least three times out of four it means the cup of the wrath of God. This, then, it seems reasonable to infer, was the cup which Jesus put to His lips so reluctantly, from which He shrank so earnestly.

'The wrath of God' is a phrase with which Paul has made us familiar; but these anthropomorphisms have their danger. God's wrath is not the righteous indignation of an offended monarch. The God of whom we speak is He 'of whom, and through whom, and unto whom are all things.' The world is God's world; to sin is to go against the constitution of things. God's wrath is the reaction of the world against our way of life, the reaction most of all of that which is Divine in ourselves.

Mr. MARTIN aptly quotes the reply of Arthur Dimmesdale (in 'The Scarlet Letter') when Hester parried his question 'Hast thou found peace?' with the counter question 'Hast thou?' 'Were I an atheist, a man devoid of conscience, a wretch with coarse and brutal instincts, I might have found peace long ere now. Nay, I should never have lost it! But, as matters stand with my soul, whatever

of good capacity there originally was in me, all of God's gifts that were the choicest have become the ministers of spiritual torment. Hester, I am most miserable.'

But a man need not drink this cup alone. It is a commonplace that our sins involve in suffering innocent people whom we do not even know. The Old Testament rises to the strange thought that our sins have consequences even for God. 'Thou hast made me to serve with thy sins.' As Professor J. E. McFadyen has put it (on Is 43²⁴), instead of Israel serving God 'she had, by reason of her sins, made him serve her, her guilt imposing upon him the burden of punishing her by exile, and the task of restoring her again.'

Whatever the Cup of Jesus was, it was certainly not fear of physical death. Jesus had braved the wrath of man too often to be afraid now. A recent writer spoke of Jesus being 'trapped in Jerusalem.' Surely the whole story testifies that in one respect Jesus did not go as a lamb to the slaughter. He went deliberately, knowing what awaited Him. His Father had given Him the Cup to drink and He would drink it.

Even we, with our sensibilities blunted, as those of Jesus were not, by familiarity with life's lower levels, can see enough even in the immediate circumstances to account for His horror of the Cup. He may have cherished, almost till the last, the hope that the Temple would become once more God's house of prayer. Now He knew that the day was coming when stone would be torn from stone, knew that that was its fate because the guardians of the Temple had yielded to the temptation which Jesus had resisted so strenuously; they put the Jewish kingdom before God's kingdom.

The story of Jesus' relations with Judas is passed over almost in silence by the gospel tradition; we can guess that Judas' treachery played a large part in the filling up of the Cup. That the crowd should turn against Him was perhaps no great marvel to

one who knew human nature in its surface moods as well as in the depths of its possibilities. The point at which we feel we have reached a region where our scales and measuring-rods cannot help us, is when we try to fathom what it meant to the pure spirit of Jesus, no longer merely to foresee, but to realize with all the bitterness of actual experience, that when God's Son enters the world and does the works of God, the world's answer is the thong and the jeer, the crown of thorns and the cross.

In the Cup that Jesus drank during those last hours there was one element peculiarly perplexing and distressing, an experience that has dismayed others who have tried to live their lives in the spirit in which He lived His. When Moses first began to work for the redemption of his people, the disheartening thing was not so much that his efforts failed, but that his very attempt to alleviate their lot resulted only in increasing their burdens. Besides doing their day's 'darg' of bricks as before, they now had to find their own materials as well.

When David Livingstone began to try to heal the open sore of Africa, the first result of his labour was to facilitate the operations of the slave-dealers. The missionaries who went out to support Livingstone drooped and died; the slave-dealers drove their prisoners down those very roads which Livingstone had hoped would be pathways to the redemption of the bondsmen.

If the work of Jesus produced a Peter, a John, a Magdalene, it provided a stage also for a Herod, a Pilate, a Caiaphas. 'If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin.' But for Jesus, Judas might have lived a respectable life and died a commonplace death. Is there not something of this feeling in the curious explanation of the parable method that Mark puts into the mouth of Jesus? 'For the outsiders everything is put in parabolic form, so that they may see without perceiving, and hear without understanding, in case they turn and find forgiveness.' Verily the waters of a full cup were wrung out to Him.

Thus did Jesus at the end of His ministry stand on one side with sinful men over against the holy God; even as at the beginning of His ministry He joined the multitudes that went to the baptism of John for the remission of sins. Hence the cry from the Cross, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'

Did Jesus Himself realize at that moment that in His dereliction, when He felt that God was hiding His face, He was Himself the supreme revelation of God who bears our sins on His heart? The writer to the Hebrews found a kind of foreshadowing of the sacrifice of Jesus in the slaughter of helpless animals. Its true Old Testament analogue is in the cry of sacrificial father-love, 'Would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!' The cup of Jesus has now become

the Holy Cup

With all its wreathen steps of passion-flowers
And quivering sparkles of the ruby stars.

Last year Professor J. M. SHAW delivered six Lectures at the Western Theological Seminary at Pittsburgh. These have now been published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (for review see 'Literature'). The Lectures all deserve the most careful attention. The subject of the second Lecture is 'Fatherhood and Prayer.' Professor SHAW is very well aware that true prayer is more than petition, but in this lecture he confines himself to petitionary prayer, and deals with the possibility and the reasonableness of asking not only for spiritual benefits but also material ones in a world which is 'governed by law.'

How can petitionary prayer be efficacious if we are living under a system of law which is really a rigid, closed, mechanical system bound together by the iron bands of natural law? If this were a true description of the world, Professor SHAW agrees that petitionary prayer could not be efficacious in any real sense, although it might have a subjective influence. But it is not a true description.

Modern scientific and philosophical thought is increasingly realizing and insisting that nature is rather a living, moving, growing organism, existing only in a spiritual context and controlled and energized for spiritual ends. What is meant, then, by 'uniformity of nature' is that the world is governed according to law in the sense that the same cause is found to be uniformly followed by the same effect. 'In a more definite Christian phraseology, the principle of the uniformity of nature is the expression of the stability of God's method working in nature.' 'It is the very "grammar of the love of God," not the operation of an external mechanical necessity to be accepted with resignation.'

But there is a further point to be borne in mind. It is that 'this system of law which we speak of as nature is not all one homogeneous piece. There are different strata, different grades or levels in it, each subject to laws proper to its own order, and descriptive of its own distinctive or characteristic modes of behaviour or procedure. Three chief grades or levels in this system are usually distinguished.' They are the inorganic, the organic, and, third, the order of intelligence. In this scale of orders each lower order is 'not a rigid, closed or self-contained system but is open to control or modification, because utilization, by the order or orders above.' The system of nature is not subjection to the ends of personality, and the evidence of that, as Carlyle observed, is that I can freely stretch out my hand. The system of laws which we speak of as our bodies we utilize freely for personal ends, and the very condition of our being able to use them is that they are stable and uniform.

And so the more we learn or discover the laws of nature, the more controllable nature becomes to the ends of personal will. To illustrate. 'An ocean liner with hundreds of lives on board is in imminent peril in mid-Atlantic, rendered helpless and out of control by the angry storm. Once that liner must have been left to its own helplessness, or to the limited resources of its own provision. But through

the discovery in recent days of more of the system of nature's laws, the mind of man has learned to manipulate natural forces in a new way, so that now appeal for help can be sent out by "wireless," across the distances, in answer to which appeal great ships change their courses and hurry to the place of danger.'

If it is true, then, that man is able more and more with advancing knowledge of nature's laws to use them for ends of personal value, can we set any limits to the sphere of God's working in answer to prayer? 'Who would be so rash as to attempt to set bounds to the possibilities of the working of Him who in His activities in the world is limited, not by any obstacles or hindrances outside of Himself, as man is, but only by such conditions as proceed from His own character as wise and holy Love, and whom, therefore, we call our Almighty Heavenly Father?'

But there is a further point. Prayer is not only possible in a world of law but it is rationally necessary. 'That God, being the God He is, namely, our Heavenly Father who has created the universe at the first and controls and governs it chiefly for moral and spiritual ends with His children, has provided in His universe of law a place for prayer, and further makes the bestowal of His blessings on ourselves and others dependent on prayer—this, when we consider it, so far from being arbitrary or strange, is in line with God's method everywhere. It is, indeed, itself a case of law.' It is one illustration of a law of God's working that God, being essentially and centrally Father, conditions the bestowal of His blessings on the co-operation with Him of His children. This is true in the field of scientific discovery. God 'does not blazon His truth on the skies, so that man has only to open his eyes to see it. Only when men give themselves to intellectual labour and toil is God given a chance to bestow His blessings of truth on the world for our own and others' good.'

'Just as in the natural world unless men work,

and as in the intellectual world unless men think, God cannot bestow His gifts: so in the moral and spiritual world unless men pray, God is not given the opportunity for the bestowal of His chiefest blessings on men.'

And if we ask why this is so, the answer is that God's chief concern is the development of character. If in the intellectual world God were to bestow His gifts of truth without our having to exercise our brains, where were the opportunity for the development of the intellectual side of our being?

So then to the question, 'Can prayer count in a world of law?' Professor Shaw's reasoned reply is: 'Yes, prayer can and does count, just because the world in which we live is a world of law, and because Love, Father-love, is "creation's final law." Because this is so, as Dora Greenwell says in one of her Essays, "Prayer is itself one of these laws, upon whose working God has determined that a certain result shall follow."''

The New Psychology has made rapid strides of recent years, and its application to Religion has been fruitfully discussed in Principal Selbie's 'Psychology of Religion.' It was inevitable that its methods and discoveries should be tested upon the field of Biblical religion. Suggestive contributions to this discussion have been made by Joyce in 'The Inspiration of Prophecy,' and more recently by Principal H. Wheeler Robinson in an article on 'The Psychology and Metaphysic of "Thus saith Yahweh"' in the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* for 1923. Now comes a book, small indeed, but full of matter, by Major J. W. POVAH, B.D., on *The New Psychology and the Bible* (Longmans; 1s.).

It is an unconventional book, racily written and abounding in fresh things, pictorially put. The very first page, for example, strikingly compares the body—flesh animated by spirit—to the Indian

'dust devil,' the spiral column of dust whirled along by the wind, which collapses into its pristine indistinguishable dust the moment the wind drops. The spirit of Yahweh, by which man is animated, is, like the wind, the mysterious, miraculous, capricious, incalculable thing.

It is also the abnormal thing. The desert dust in repose represents normality; it is the wind that disturbs this and creates the unanticipated thing. So 'every striking psychological abnormality is associated with the Ruach and ascribed to the direct action of Yahweh.' When the normal man becomes abnormal, like Samson with his amazing feats of strength, like Gideon or Jephthah with their gifts of courage and leadership, like Samuel's 'Mad Mullahs' with their religious frenzy, or like Sennacherib when he lost his nerve before Jerusalem, it is because the Spirit of Yahweh has leaped upon him or taken possession of him.

Thus 'What we call the incalculable outcroppings of the unconscious—whether outcroppings of goodness or wickedness, of sanity or insanity, of morale or panic—are all ascribed to the Ruach of Yahweh.' But clearly here there is a peril for religion pure and undefiled. Are all 'inspirations' of equal value? Is Elijah when he massacres his opponents in cold blood, and is Elisha when he instigates a blood-thirsty revolution, as 'inspired' as in those other acts of their career of which the modern conscience approves?

The prophetic historians J and E felt the difficulty, and they partially solved it by recognizing degrees of inspiration. In the famous passage Nu 12⁶⁻⁸ a distinction is drawn between the fragmentary methods of dream and vision and 'the constant intercourse, the constantly renewed conversation,' which such a one as Moses may have, 'mouth to mouth,' with Yahweh. Micaiah ben-Imlah goes further and distinguishes between true and false inspiration (1 K 22). The false prophets are indeed 'inspired,' but Yahweh Himself has deceived them. It is a terrible theology, yet the

psychology it implies marks an advance. 'Not all the out-cropping of the unconscious, not all that passes for inspiration, is true.' And a further advance is made in the story of Elijah (1 K 19), which suggests that the violent outcroppings of the unconscious may not be inspirations at all, for it is in 'the sound of a low whisper' that Yahweh speaks to those who really listen to Him.

But here, as in so many other matters, the supreme advance is made by the literary prophets. Amos draws a clear and sharp distinction between the genuine inspiration of Yahweh and inspiration falsely so called (3^{7f.} 7^{14f.}), and this advance in psychology is accompanied by a corresponding advance in Ethics and Theology.

It is upon Hosea, however, that Major POVAH spends his main strength. Only a month or two ago he gave us a fresh translation of that prophet, which was published by the National Adult School Union, and in terms of the New Psychology he has given us a strikingly modern interpretation of Hosea's mind, which more than justifies him in describing Hosea as 'a great psychologist.' Here, as in much else, he anticipates Jeremiah.

Major POVAH rightly begins by calling attention to 'the immense importance which Hosea attaches to the sex instinct.' That is surely very modern. Hosea is a great psychologist because he is a great lover. His call, his apprehension of Yahweh's character, his description of the national apostasy, are all expressed in terms of this fundamental instinct. This instinct is no more to be despised as unworthy or irrelevant to the higher life than any other instinct: what it needs is not suppression but sublimation, whether in the case of Gomer or Israel or ourselves. 'For genuine Hebrew thought does not suspect the instincts. The instincts are the gift of Yahweh.' Earlier in the discussion Major POVAH had suggestively transformed the phrase 'a living soul' into 'an animal with instincts.'

It is not man's instincts that are wrong, it is his intellect—of which, to the Hebrew, the heart is the seat. The people are stupid, they 'do not know Yahweh' (5⁴). But whose fault is that? It is their own; for the clause immediately before this runs, 'they are obsessed by lust for fornication.' Thus their failure is at bottom moral rather than intellectual; and it is in the effort to explain that here we are not really caught in a circular argument that Major PОВАН says some of the most arresting things in his book.

Starting from the remarkable passage, 'Ephraim's iniquity is bound up, his error is hidden,' he explains that this is exactly what the New Psychology would call a 'buried complex.' The sin is 'repressed' and hidden from consciousness, and it can never be healed until it is brought out and faced. The trouble with Ephraim is that, 'like Peter Pan, he won't grow up.' The ultimate iniquity is the refusal to face the living God—'Let not God speak with us, lest we die.' This is also the supreme folly, for God is the great reality. To repress the thought of Him is to stumble at every step on the path of life. Hosea's treatment of this idea of 'stumbling over one's iniquity' (5⁵), in which he anticipates the very words of Jung in his 'Psychology of the Unconscious,' stamps him as a master psychologist. Until the thing repressed into unconsciousness is brought out and faced, it remains there a perpetual stumbling-block over which one inevitably trips.

So the 'buried complex' must be resolved, and for this 'man needs a psychotherapist.' Here follows a brief but suggestive discussion of the Suffering Servant of Yahweh, who 'bears away the error of many by enabling them to face it.' 'It is clear that to the author of the "Servant Songs" man needs something to be done for him which he cannot do for himself.' This something is thus described by Major PОВАН: 'By bearing our perversions, the Servant of Yahweh cures our complex.' If this sounds almost distressingly modern, it at least helps us to understand the psycho-

logical as well as the ethical insight of the Hebrew prophets. They at any rate faced reality, if men ever did. And so it is not perhaps too much to claim for the New Psychology that it has 'rediscovered the gospel.'

A most interesting little book has been written by the Rev. W. Emery BARNES, D.D., on *Early Christians at Prayer, 1-400 A.D.*, with a chapter on 'Early Prayers for the Departed' (Methuen; 3s. 6d. net). The chief aim of the book is to give specimen Christian prayers uttered under various conditions and needs. There are chapters on 'Prayer in the Old Testament' and 'Prayer in the New Testament,' early liturgical prayers, prayers in face of persecution, prayers of great Christian teachers, and 'Early Christian Teaching concerning Prayer.' Chrysostom, Hilary, Augustine, Origen, Basil, and Gregory Nazianzen are all represented. There is a great deal of sound scholarship in the book, and many enlightening reflections on the nature of prayer, and the book as a whole illustrates in a striking way the course of God's progressive education of man.

One of the most interesting chapters is on the Lord's Prayer. At the present time it has become pre-eminently a form for public use. In the Book of Common Prayer it occurs sixteen or seventeen times. But in the earliest days it stood in a different position. The first disciples still used the Temple prayers in their public devotions. 'They continued stedfastly with one accord in the Temple . . . praising God.' But they desired to be taught by Jesus to pray as He prayed, as it was the way of religious seekers in the East to follow closely the religious practices of their leader.

St. Luke tells us how the prayer was originally given. It is true the First Gospel gives it as part of the Sermon on the Mount. But it is unlikely that so intimate a devotion would first be recited

and cried aloud on a hillside to thousands of listeners. And we know that while Luke narrates the actual occasions of our Lord's teaching, Matthew tends to group the teachings irrespective of occasion. Matthew inserts the *Paternoster* as an illustration of the point Jesus is making about avoiding many words in prayer. The prayer which Jesus taught, then, was of a private character. It is, indeed, social: 'After this manner pray ye,' but that means 'Pray ye, each one of you, after this manner.'

The prayer has come down to us in two recensions. At first the difference between the two seems large, but this is hardly the case in fact. The additions in Matthew are explanations and are not unwanted. The prayer in Luke's version cries out for some expansion. *E.g.* the startling petition 'Bring us not into temptation' refuses to be left standing alone as Luke leaves it. We may pray that our life's road may not run through the valley of Temptation, but we need to pray also that when we are in the valley we may be delivered from Apollyon. And in Matthew we have this necessary addition.

It may be asked: What, then, is the value of the shorter version? The answer is twofold. For one thing, the existence of two versions shows us that our Lord does not tie us to one form of words. He gave us in the *Paternoster* a spirit that can be expressed in more than one form. The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. Further, the Lord's Prayer is surely meant to be the centre, not the circumference, of our devotions. In Luke's form we have the bare centre, in Matthew's it is already reaching outwards to include the fuller thoughts to which it must needs give occasion. This fullness of meaning can only be learned by experience, and the prayer must be used for a lifetime to have its rich content understood.

The structure of the prayer is suggestive. There are two sections, each characterized by the use of

its own pronoun. In the first section the pronoun is 'thy': thy name, thy kingdom, thy will. In the second the pronoun is 'us': give us, forgive us, lead us, deliver us. This contrast is illuminating. In the second section we ask boons for ourselves. Such petitions are allowed by the Divine Teacher as a necessary part of prayer. But since it is God our Father with whom we have to do, asking does not come first, at least in the pattern Christian prayer. For us submission and adoration must come before asking.

Indeed, submission is the leading note in both sections of the prayer. There is complete submission in the petition 'thy kingdom come,' the submission of a subject to a king. The same attitude is found in the petition for bread: 'Give us to-day *our loaf*.' It is a request for a minimum, just for the satisfying of the elementary need of man. The words will not stretch to cover any desire for luxuries or for wealth. Jerome translates the epithet in the phrase just given 'super-substantial bread.' But that is impossible. The general sense of it is 'the usual bread.' The special sense may be 'bread for the day which is just beginning,' or, 'bread which falleth to us in the circumstances in which we are.' We ask for the loaf which is our portion for the day, leaving it to our Father to add more, if He will.

The same note of submission is found in the next clause: 'Forgive us our debts.' We come as debtors to God, not having wherewith to pay. And still more in the clause: 'Bring us not into temptation.' Here is the confession that we are not our own guides. We are led through life. This deep submission of man to God is alien from much of the religious thought of the present day which emphasizes the immanence of God in Nature and in man. But the nearness of God does not exclude His greatness. The Lord's Prayer allows both. Before we finish the prayer we learn that we are in the presence not of 'Our Father' only, but of One who is both God and Father.

Paul's Personal Religion.

BY PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE, D.D., HACKNEY AND NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

1. It has been the common rule to treat Christ as the object and not also as the subject of religion, and Paul as a theologian and not as a believer. (a) Deissmann in his recent volume on *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul* challenges this procedure; and we may acknowledge that he is right in so doing. As the author of a book entitled *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus*, I may claim to be in cordial agreement as regards his treatment of the religion of Jesus. In another book, *Studies of Paul and his Gospel*, I have dealt with the man before I have treated the message; and thus fully recognized the truth of his insistence that the experience is primary, and the theology secondary. (b) But as regards Paul, he seems to me to carry his contention further than an adequate recognition of all the facts allows. Whether the influence of Greek culture upon him was much or little, he was influenced by it. He had been trained as a Jewish scribe, and the Jewish scribe survived in the Christian apostle, and affected his interpretation and exposition of his faith even in his letters. Granted that these were the letters of a missionary to churches that he had founded, he was not in them concerned merely with an edifying communication of his gospel, but he was defending that gospel against Jewish or Gentile objections, and the weapons he used were necessarily intellectual weapons, arguments for the mind as well as appeals to the heart. He not only bore the testimony of experience, but developed on the basis of that experience with the intellectual resources of his environment a philosophy of the world and life as well as a theology of God and man and their mutual relations. He was not himself indifferent to that intellectual exposition and vindication of his faith. Doubtless he sought primarily religious satisfaction and moral potency in his faith, but his own intellectual vigour as well as the discipline through which his mind had passed forbid the assumption that he felt no need in himself to meet the claims of his intellect for the certainty of truth. (c) However occasional and unsystematic the contents of his letters generally may have been, that does not exclude an implicit continuity and consistency in his thinking. Do Deissmann's words

apply strictly to the Epistle to the Romans as contrasted with the Epistle to the Galatians? 'We ought,' he says, 'to read the letters of Paul as unliterary letters, not as literary epistles, not as carefully-thought-out pieces of a system that was being elaborated; we must read them as confessions, inspired by particular situations. It is not necessary for us to suppose that these separate special expressions can be, or were meant to be, combined into a systematic doctrine' (*op. cit.* p. 160 f.). That Paul ever intended to elaborate a system we may, with Deissmann, confidently deny; but that there was an immanent logic in his confessions, inspired though they were by particular situations, seems an inevitable inference. The expositors of Paul have not been quite so far astray as Deissmann would make them out to be in their endeavour to give an orderly presentation of his teaching. I have recognized in my commentary on *Romans* that even behind that Epistle we can trace the particular occasion; but that Epistle is something more systematic than a confession. (d) We may cordially endorse Deissmann's words about Paul, 'to this great religious genius communion with Christ was the constant vibrating energy of life' (p. 159). Ro 6 is nearer the heart of Paul than Ro 3. Nevertheless we may refuse to dismiss as *doctrinaire* those who show 'very little recognition of the synonymy of the various Pauline expressions,' and decline to regard Justification, Reconciliation, and Redemption as simply variant terms for Communion with Christ. The solution is always Christ; but each of these terms does stand for a different problem in the mind of Paul; and Deissmann, while asserting the synonymy of Paul's religious confessions himself, recognizes these differences. 'In all these figurative expressions (justification, reconciliation, forgiveness, redemption, and adoption),' he says, 'man stands before God each time in a different guise before the same God, first as an accused person, secondly as an enemy, thirdly as a debtor, fourthly and fifthly as a slave. In all these uses man is in an abnormal and bad position. Then, in Christ, he comes into the normal and good position' (p. 208). But were these expressions

only different figures for the same moral and religious reality, or did they express differences in the complex human personality in its relation to God? (e) It seems to me that Deissmann attempts to simplify Paul's experience much more than the facts allow. His experience of Christ was a complex of varied capacities, necessities, purposes, and influences from his environment, which cannot be exhaustively stated in one simple formula. While we shall be concerned here with Paul's personal religion, his theology was not merely a confession of it, but, as is inevitable, there was a reaction of his theology on his experience; for an experience expounded and vindicated as was Paul's, in answer to the challenges of the thought of the environment, is not the same unchanged experience, which it would have been, had the implicit not been made explicit; since the articulation is the development of an experience.

2. In his insistence on the experience of Paul as the decisive factor in his theology, Deissmann, however, is right as against a current type of scholarship, which resolves a great religious personality into the mere resultant of the varied religious influences of his environment, and minimizes, if it does not altogether exclude, the originality of genius in the realm of religion as in other regions, and the reality of the Divine activity to which religion is responsive. (a) One finds it hard not to be impatient with and even irritated by a learning which has no insight, and which, having little or no religion itself, cannot appreciate religion in others. It is true that 'spiritual things can only be spiritually discerned'; and there must be some spiritual affinity with Paul in him who would understand, and offer an interpretation of Paul. Hence such a book as Morgan's *The Religion and Theology of Paul* explains by the influence of the environment what a finer discernment would trace to the experience, while admitting the influence of the environment on the mode in which the experience found expression. (b) What we must postulate, unless we are to dismiss Paul's experience as illusive, is the reality of his experience of the living Christ; he was assuredly one of 'the greater works' of Christ after His resurrection; he had an intimate communion with Christ, and knew the immediate action of Christ in his inner life. But even his experience was limited and conditioned, as all human experience must be, by the receptivity and responsiveness of the medium, his

complex personality, made what it was by many factors.

3. Before we attempt to interpret the experience we must examine the medium. (a) As the religious consciousness is not unaffected by the organic conditions, it may first of all be observed that he was small, sickly, and sensitive and with a fear of death as physical dissolution, and yet possessed a vitality which enabled him to sustain a strain before which others would have succumbed. Although we may regard as unproved the suggestion that he suffered from epilepsy, his 'stake in the flesh' seems to have been some form of disease which not only endangered his life but which he himself felt as a humiliation, and to the endurance of which he was reconciled only by a definite assurance of the sufficiency of the Divine grace. He was of an intensely emotional temperament, and under the stress of emotion subject to those abnormal psychical conditions which are included in the New Testament among the *charisms*, and which have been characteristic of many mystics; he saw visions and heard voices, spoke with tongues, and his dreams were significant for his religious life. He was nevertheless keen in intellect, and sane in judgment. While he used the methods of reasoning which he had learned in the Rabbinic schools, and may have followed in the form of his presentation of his thought the *diatribe* of the Greek philosopher, his mind was essentially intuitive rather than ratiocinative; he saw *truth* in *pictures*. The presentation is figurative, as for instance in that passage about the Incarnation, on which abstract theories of kenosis have been unwarrantably based. Or again, his representation of the negative and the positive aspects of Christian life—renunciation and realization—as crucifixion and resurrection with Christ. His figures are not merely illustrations, analogies; they are the necessary modes of his visualizing of his thought. It is a characteristic declaration 'we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen' (2 Co 4¹⁸). In this connexion it may be observed that while he was keenly interested in the ways and works of men—the builder, the gardener, the soldier, the athlete—he was indifferent to the sights and sounds of Nature. His imagination did not find any sustenance there.

(b) He had the realizing imagination which made the invisible as real as the visible. He had prob-

ably a more vivid consciousness of the presence of the living Christ than any other Christian believer has had. For his *mysticism* Christ was never a ladder up which he climbed to an ecstatic experience of the indefinable and ineffable Deity, and which could be left behind; but for him God always was in Christ, and he sought no immediate contact with God above and beyond his intimate communion with Christ. But his statement in 1 Co 15²⁸, 'then shall the son also himself be subjected to God . . . that God may be all in all,' does suggest the question: Did he anticipate a relation to God transcending such mediation? This, however, is a solitary utterance. (c) His mysticism was not sustained by human discovery and achievement, but by Divine disclosure and communication. In it faith received and responded to grace. I am in entire accord with Deissmann in the distinction which he makes between the two types of mysticism. 'The one type is everywhere present where the mystic regards his communion with God as an experience in which the action of God upon him produces a reaction towards God. The other type of mysticism is that in which the mystic regards his communion with God as his own action, from which a reaction follows on the part of Deity' (p. 195). Rightly he regards Paul's as a Reacting Mysticism, a religion of grace and not of works. (d) May not the difference between the two types be due to a more or less sensitive conscience, a more or less acute experience of moral struggle? Speculative mysticism, which seeks the answer to a question of the mind, will tend to self-sufficiency: practical mysticism, which strives for the solution of the problem of the disquieted conscience or the enslaved will, will realize man's insufficiency, and depend on God. For Paul, morality no less than religion was a problem. His references to the flesh have led some to assume that he was specially beset by sensual temptations; but this assumption is not necessary to explain the account of the inward struggle in Ro 7⁷⁻²⁵. A sensitive conscience may no less intensify the inward struggle than a clamorous appetite. A man of so intense emotion and passionate affection, as we know Paul to have been, we must admit, may have been subject to the temptations of the flesh. What is certain is that the inner conflict in him was severe and tried him sorely. His was not a passive, but an active, nay, even an *explosive* nature; his experience was

likely to be not evolutionary but catastrophic, not gradual development but violent crisis. So much the available evidence allows us to say about his complex personality, the raw material of his religious experience and moral character.

4. The development of that personality was necessarily affected by his environment. (a) As one who was brought up as far as was possible in the ways of strict Scottish piety and conduct in a foreign land uncongenial and even hostile to them, I can understand better what the Jewish boy in Tarsus passed through. As far as possible isolated from, and even taught to distrust, fear, and avoid the ways of his environment, he could not altogether escape its influence. It does seem to me that Sir William Ramsay, with a pardonable zeal for, and pride in, what his researches can contribute to the understanding of Paul, has exaggerated the extent of that influence, and has ascribed to the earlier years of boyhood what may have affected his mind, when more readily opened to that Gentile environment in after years, even after he became the apostle of the Gentiles. Or possibly when his Jewish exclusiveness was transcended, the memories of his boyhood, suppressed in his Pharisaic period, may have returned, and exercised a more potent influence than even in his early years. His recoil from Pharisaic Judaism made him more responsive to his Gentile environment. Undoubtedly he had a wider horizon than the apostles who knew only Galilee and Jerusalem. His Roman citizenship, of which he was proud, and which could be useful to him in travel throughout the Roman Empire, was undoubtedly afterwards one of the reasons for and motives to his choice of his fields of labour. His violent reaction against the Pharisaism which had not brought him satisfaction or deliverance was also a factor in this decision. He himself ascribes his choice to a direct Divine command after his conversion (Ac 22¹⁷⁻²¹); but as in that record there seem to be, if we may use the phrase, subsequent experiences telescoped, we cannot be absolutely certain that he did not read in his retrospect later into earlier experiences. If there was a conscious Divine command, it came, and could not otherwise have come, to a prepared mind, in which we may recognize the memories of his earlier life in Tarsus as a factor. But I do not believe that his religious thought was to any appreciable extent determined by Greek philosophy, or his religious life by the pagan mystery religions.

His exposition of his experience may have been affected by these influences, which probably came into his life at a later stage. At least we must avoid rashly explaining by external borrowings what may be understood as inward gains. On these matters more will need to be said at a later stage of the discussion.

(b) As a boy or youth Paul went to Jerusalem to be trained in a Rabbinic school (Ac 22³); and I am absolutely convinced that he was most potently influenced by his Jewish environment. It seems to me a safe rule to prefer a Jewish to a Gentile derivation of any element in his religion, morals, or theology. For instance, I should not hesitate to insist on the derivation of his use of the term Lord for Christ from Septuagint usage rather than from the use of the term in Gentile cults. In view of all the Old Testament has to say about God as Saviour, it is not necessary to seek the source of Paul's view of Christ's Saviourhood in a mystery religion. In his sacramentalism (Ro 6¹⁻¹¹ and 1 Co 11²³⁻³⁴) he may have been influenced by what he knew of the mystery religions; but he did not merely adapt to the Christian ordinances borrowed ideas; ultimately, what he thought was based on what he himself had experienced. His own baptism, especially when he read back later developments into the content of his experience then, had been truly an inward crisis, 'a new creation, old things passing away, and all things becoming new' (2 Co 5¹⁷). His own participation in the Supper of the Lord was to him not only a commemoration of a past event, but a communication of a present gift of grace. His experience was what it was in its main features because he had been a Jew, and not a Gentile, before his conversion; and Jewish traits survived in him after he was converted.

5. We can now address ourselves to an examination of his experience. (a) From Ph 3⁴⁻⁶ we may infer that for a time, at least, he was a contented Pharisee, self-righteous; but Ro 7⁷⁻²⁵ seems to prove that his satisfaction did not continue long. Whether v. 7 refers to a distinct moral crisis, in which he discovered that while his outward life was blameless he did not, and could not, conform to the law in his desires, or the process of self-discovery was gradual, we cannot confidently determine. What is certain is that he tragically experienced his bondage to sin, and consequent misery. His problem was not primarily how sin can be forgiven, but how its bondage can be ended. But it may

be that the law's demand for a righteousness which because of this bondage he could not render, intensified the distress of his soul; the sense of guilt may have been joined to the feeling of enslavement.

It is only by this distress of soul that his fury as a persecutor (Ac 26⁹⁻¹¹) can be explained. He was a man of tender heart, passionate but not cruel. Why did he do violence to his nature in his zeal against the Christians? Did he hope thereby to win some merit that might compensate for his failure to keep the law perfectly? Was he outraged in feeling by the declaration of the Christians that the long-promised and much-hoped-for Messiah had died an accursed death, as the law declared such a death as Jesus had suffered on Calvary to be (Gal 3¹³)? Was he tormented by the doubt or fear that this awful calamity might have befallen his people, and so the hopes placed on the Messiah's coming had proved vain? Did he persevere in his fury despite some misgivings, as the words about kicking against the ox-goad suggest (Ac 9⁵ 26¹⁴)? Had the bearing of the sorely tried Christians so impressed him as to raise the question in his mind: Might not this affirmation be true? Even sudden and striking crises in life are in some measure prepared, and so Christ appeared to him in the fullness of time.

(b) What he experienced was not a subjective vision, a hallucination of sense resulting from his desire or expectancy, for there is no evidence of any such condition. He describes his conversion as an abortion, an unnatural and violent birth (1 Co 15⁸); it was no normal, moral, or religious process. Of the reality of Christ's presence he was convinced, even although his accounts of that experience blend with it what may have belonged to a later date. I at least assume that this experience was not of the same subjective kind as those described in 2 Co 12¹⁶; for on it he rests his claim to apostleship as he does not on them. This experience was something more than the visions or the voices mystics have claimed to enjoy. (c) The first result was the certainty that Jesus was risen, and that He was the Christ. The second result was his conviction that the death could not have been accursed, but must have some meaning and worth in relation to His work as Messiah. It must have taken him time for thought before he worked out such a theory as is formulated in Ro 3; but I do not believe that he did not find a solution of the

problem of the death till after his ministry had begun. The call to find a solution was too clamorous for any such delay. His mind was, as I have said, explosive, and so his thought was very rapid. He was an instructed and intelligent theologian, with abundant material of knowledge, and decisive movement of judgment enabling him to find the desired solution swift and sure. I do not believe that for a time he had not advanced beyond the common eschatological view as presented in 1 and 2 Thessalonians, although his preaching may for a time have been mainly in accord with the common apostolic tradition. I hold strongly that the Epistle to the Galatians was his first epistle, and that it was separated by a considerable interval of time from the Epistle to the Romans with which it is usually associated. In the one we have the vehement assertion of truth reached in a great upheaval of the inner life; in the other the deliberate exposition of truths that had by meditation been wrought out in their manifold bearings. Not years, but only months of intense inward life were necessary for him to reach his distinctive gospel as it is presented in Galatians. What the law had pronounced an accursed death was the death that removed the curse on the transgressor of the law, who by faith and faith alone received the grace of God in the forgiveness of, and deliverance from, sin. (d) Paul himself soon experienced the relieved conscience and the released will. I believe that for Paul both aspects of salvation from sin were essential to complete satisfaction; but I cannot escape the impression that the exposition of how forgiveness is provided in the death of Christ is more objective, and the confession of how there is deliverance from sin by union with Christ is more subjective, the one more a doctrine, the other more an experience. We are nearer the core of Paul's personality in Ro 6 than in Ro 3. Gal 2²⁰ takes us into his holy of holies: 'I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me.' But, as the last clause shows, the two aspects are not separable; he died and lived with the Christ who had died for him, and his life in Christ was a life in which he was ever experiencing both deliverance from sin and the forgiveness of his sin. Compare with this early so late an utterance as that in Ph 3⁸⁻¹¹, 'Yea

verily, and I count all things to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may gain Christ, and be found in him, not having a righteousness of mine own, even that which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith: that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, becoming conformed unto his death; if by any means I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead.' In this remarkable statement he weaves into the pattern of his communion with Christ, inward death and inward life in Him, two elements which do not seem to be so close to the heart of his religion—his doctrine of justification by faith, and the expectation which he continued to cherish, despite occasional moods of despondency when the hope grew dim, of his survival to the time of witnessing the Second Advent in power and glory, and the resurrection of the dead at Christ's Coming (see vv.²⁰⁻²¹). This personal union with Christ is the constant dominating factor in the religious experience and moral character of Paul. It was surely the certainty of the vision of Christ on the way to Damascus, and the inward revelation which it so speedily brought about in him, which explains the continuance and potency of this factor in him, as it has not been experienced, or at least confessed by any other.

(e) Because this relation to Christ was so creative the old things passed away, and all things became new. For the earlier apostles there was room for Christ as they conceived and experienced Him alongside of the law, and the beliefs and rites of their Judaism. Christ so filled Paul that there was no longer room for all that had been even more to him than to them. For the excellency of the knowledge of Christ he not only could, but must count all these things but loss. Not only so, the law had been to him a burden, and had threatened him with a curse; instead of bringing deliverance, it had only intensified the miserable bondage of sin. He recoiled from it, as he was attracted to Christ; he revolted against it, as he submitted to the Lordship of Christ. The Judaism of which he had been once so proud, and made a boast, was now refuse to him (Ph 3⁸). As a Pharisee, Judaism was to him all, now it became nothing as a satisfaction of his soul, for he was not a man who could

do things by halves. While he did cherish the memories of the great things God had done for His people (Ro 9¹⁻⁵), while he was ready to conform for love's sake to Jewish customs and observe Jewish rites, while he did first address himself to the Jewish synagogue to win, if it were possible, some of his kinsmen according to the flesh, for whom he cherished so passionate an affection that he was willing to be anathema from Christ for their sakes, it was inevitable from his own experience that he should become the apostle of the Gentiles, even if the Divine call had not come to him. May not the call have been not so much one single event, as the only possible result of what he had passed through; his break from Judaism in his attachment to Christ as Saviour and Lord altogether and alone sufficient for the soul's need?

(f) This was his distinctive experience: he did grow in truth and grace; he did adapt himself to his Gentile environment, 'becoming all things to all men if by any means he might save some' (1 Co 9²²); he was influenced doubtless in his presentation of the gospel by current modes of thought, such as Stoic philosophy, or the Gentile mystery cults; with the insight of genius he sought the points of contact and the lines of least resistance; and his sympathetic attitude reacted upon his own experience, as in his sacramentalism, which is his own experience coloured by the more intense religious life with which he came into contact among his converts. It was a process of living assimilation, and not of external borrowing of this or that Gentile patch to put upon his Christian garment. There can be no doubt that the Judaistic controversy compelled him to formulate his doctrine of the righteousness of God, and justifying faith; and in so formulating it the experience that lay behind it was necessarily modified, the latent was made patent. That doctrine, though it has roots in his experience, as formulated, is not so intimate a confession of his own inner life as is his *faith-mysticism*. Again, speculations about the place of Christ among angels in the churches of Asia Minor compelled him to supplement his soteriology with a Christology; but the cosmic significance he assigns in the Epistles of the Captivity is a secondary element, while the moral and spiritual value of Christ in his own experience is primary. To say that Paul passed through an eschatological, soteriological, and cosmological stage of development

seems to me to misrepresent the essential continuity and consistency of his Christian life as determined in its main features by his conversion. The change, such as it is, is in the circumference of expression and not at the centre of experience, although, as has already been conceded, expression does and cannot but react on experience.

(g) These seem to me two respects in which not his distinctive experience, but the Christian tradition he received, the eschatology of the primitive community, was modified. As a reference already given in Philippians (3²¹) shows, he never consciously abandoned the expectation of the Second Advent. But sometimes he desponded as regards his own survival to that great day. He found comfort in the assurance which came to him that to be absent from the body was to be present with the Lord, and that he would not be left unclothed, but clothed upon, that what is mortal might be swallowed up of life (2 Co 5¹⁻¹⁰). Although he did not draw the conclusion, his present experience of Christ threw into the background the Second Coming of Christ. Again, his experience as an apostle to the Gentiles brought him the vision of the Church, the body of Christ, the fulfilment of Him that fulfilleth all in all (Eph 1²³), in which Jew and Gentile should form one community. The horizon of the Epistle to the Ephesians and of Ro 9-11 is far wider than that of the Second Advent hope, and presupposes a far longer historical prospect. It is lamentable that the Church has from time to time revived a temporary phase of Christian, inherited from Jewish, thought which the apostle himself outgrew, although he was not himself aware of the change. For him 'to live was Christ, and to die was gain' (Ph 1²¹).

(h) How far can we, and need we, desire that our own experience should be of the same type as his? It is a legitimate question to ask, as both in the New Testament and in the history of the Christian Church other types have emerged, the claim of which to the Christian name cannot be denied. While we must not do violence to our own capacity and disposition, two reasons why we should desire to have an experience such as Paul's may be suggested. *First of all*, is it not in itself attractive, giving to Christ a significance and value such as other types do not? *Secondly*, is it not this type which has exercised a potent influence in the thought and life of the Church? We need think only of the Pauline succession of Augustine, Luther,

Wesley. We may at once set aside the hope of the Second Advent which Paul himself outgrew; but his desire for the preservation or restoration of complete personality, with an appropriate organ of expression and activity in more intimate communion and in increasing resemblance to Christ in the future life in the unseen world, I hold to be altogether one to be shared by us as the consummation of all here and now that gives life its highest value. As has been already indicated, his doctrine of the Atonement seems to me not to be so central to his experience as it is often represented as being. What does seem to me central, however, is the sense of guilt, removed by the assurance of the Divine forgiveness conveyed in the Cross of Christ, as well as the feeling of bondage, which through union with Christ was ended, the deliverance being effected by a new motive and a new power. To me

at least it seems no less necessary that the distressed conscience should find peace in a forgiveness which does not annul, but confirms God's judgment on sin, than that the enfeebled will should be renewed in strength. Forgiveness of sin seems no less essential to the Christian experience than deliverance from sin. The Pauline theology has been misunderstood and misrepresented in any statement of it in abstract terms. The personal experience of the personal presence, interest, and activity of Christ as Saviour and Lord in an entire dependence, intimate communion, and complete submission—that is the distinctive Pauline experience, which we may well covet for ourselves: to be crucified to sin, and raised to a life unto God with Christ, to suffer that we may also reign with Him, to know the fellowship of His suffering, and the power of His Risen Life.

Literature.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

PROFESSOR J. M. SHAW, M.A., D.D., of Halifax, Nova Scotia, has given us his Elliott Lectures in an excellent book, *The Christian Gospel of the Fatherhood of God* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). It is Dr. Shaw's expressed aim to restate the essentials of the Christian Faith, and he has carried out his purpose with conviction and clearness. Having in his first lecture declared the differentia of the Christian conception of God to consist in the centrality of God's Father-love, he shows, in other five lectures, how that central fact is unfolded in the efficacy of Prayer, in the Incarnation, in the Atonement, in the Resurrection of Christ, and in Regeneration. He thus preserves a fine unity in his treatment without sacrificing comprehensiveness.

Much might be said in praise of Dr. Shaw's philosophical grasp, his lucidity, his sense of the magnitude of the gospel. But what gives his book its chief distinction is that it reproduces the New Testament emphasis and tone as few books, even on the Christian religion, succeed in doing. Every page testifies to his instinct for getting to the heart of things.

We earnestly commend this book, not only to professional students of theology, but also to those who are at a loss to know how the great Christian verities stand in relation to the best modern thought. Were it only for the lecture on Prayer, the book is worthy of a wide circulation. But the whole is so admirable that it is not fair to single out any part from the rest. In Dr. Shaw the Church has a true teacher.

ASPECTS OF THE WAY.

The sub-title of *Aspects of the Way*, by Mr. A. D. Martin (Cambridge University Press; 6s. net), is 'Meditations and Studies in the Life of Jesus Christ.' Mr. Martin tells us that his primary object is to interest the general reader rather than to attract the theologian, but many a preacher will thank him for this volume. These studies of The Way (the author mourns that this earliest and most suggestive name of the Christian religion was so speedily dropped), practical and devotional as they are, are full of flashes of insight such as are given only to one who is both student and poet. The beautiful chapter on the shepherds of Bethlehem ('elect shepherds' he calls them) is a fitting

introduction to the ten studies of the life and mind of Jesus that follow.

The author seems to have little of the controversialist, but sometimes he illuminates controversies. Thus he reminds us that many Jews in our Lord's day were expecting a visible return of Elijah. If Jesus spiritualized this conception of Elijah's return, why should we assume that His references to His own return are to be taken literally? As a sample of the quality of the book, we may take the interpretation, introduced almost incidentally into the study of the Transfiguration, of the story of Jesus' dealing with the Syro-Phœnician woman. According to the account in Acts, Paul carried his gospel first to the Jews; when rejected by them he turned to the Gentiles. Mr. Martin believes that in this incident we see Jesus struggling with the temptation to pursue the policy which Paul followed afterwards. Disappointed at the reception of His message by the leaders of His own people, He felt the spell of the larger world with its greater needs and perhaps its greater open-heartedness. He went as far north as the borders of Tyre and Sidon to fight out in loneliness the battle between the two 'ways' that invited Him: to turn to the Gentiles or to go back to His thankless task among His own people. The Syro-Phœnician woman embodied in person the Gentile world that seemed to call Him; but Jesus felt that this call was a temptation: He won His battle and returned to the work He believed His Father had given Him to do.

PIONEER WORK IN AFRICA.

We have a missionary autobiography in *Days Gone By* (Murray; 16s. net), by Bishop J. E. Hine, M.A., M.D., D.D., D.C.L., M.R.C.S., the first and present Bishop of Grantham. Dr. Hine describes the story of his diversified career as 'some account of past years chiefly in Central Africa.' The son of Nonconformist parents, he wandered about London as a youth hearing preachers as different as Spurgeon, Stopford Brooke, H. R. Haweis, and Page Roberts. He says that once he heard Bishop Magee in Westminster Abbey on the Sunday after Dean Stanley died, and is able to recall this sentence in the sermon: 'There are some people in these days who are always trying to make the miraculous a little less miraculous and the supernatural a little less supernatural, the people who take such

desperate pains to lighten the labours of Omnipotence.' This was in the early seventies, and those people are still with us in 1925.

An Oxford graduate, Dr. Hine afterwards won the M.D. degree of London University. Later, he joined the Church of England and volunteered for the Universities Mission in Central Africa. He afterwards became Bishop of Licoma on Lake Nyasa. He was transferred to Zanzibar, where he laboured till ill-health compelled his return home. He accepted service at Tangier, and subsequently at Constantinople, until he was appointed the first Bishop of Northern Rhodesia. Thus he presided over three dioceses in widely separated regions of Darkest Africa during a most eventful period of eighteen years. It was pioneer work all the while under difficulties unimaginable to people at home.

Dr. Hine has the pen of a ready and a graphic writer. He has been not only a great missionary traveller, but a quite remarkable tourist through Europe. He must have seen more cathedral churches than any man living. He makes the whole changing panorama of his wanderings pass vividly before the reader's eye. He may begin the chapter in a visit to some English cathedral; before the close he is standing at the scene of Livingstone's death in the heart of Africa and celebrating the Holy Eucharist.

OLD TESTAMENT COMMENTARIES.

Twice within recent months we have had occasion to welcome several small volumes of a bright and popular commentary on the Old Testament from the distinguished pen of Canon Sell, of Madras. Four more have reached us—the volumes on Deuteronomy, Job, Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, and the Megilloth (Song of Solomon, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther). The volumes cost only one rupee each (S.P.C.K. Depository, Vepery, Madras), and we are glad to note that they can now all be obtained at the Bookroom of the Church Missionary Society, Salisbury Square, London, E.C. 4; for, though these books are written primarily for Indian pastors, they are capable of bringing information, enlightenment, and stimulus to the pastors of every English-speaking land. If the 'Fundamentalists' in America and elsewhere could be persuaded to read them with an open mind, we should not be confronted with the

sorry spectacle of a Christendom rent in twain over issues that frequently concern literary and historical facts and their interpretations rather than religious realities.

These books are all introduced by well-known men, occasionally by Bishops of the Indian Church, but in reality they need no introduction: they speak for themselves by their quality of illumination and by their persuasive simplicity. Canon Sell is ideally fitted for his task of commending the modern view of the Bible to timid people. He has something of the caution of the late Dr. Driver, so that in these volumes there are no thrills or shocks, but there is immense and solid learning, thoroughly digested, and presented with such clearness and simplicity that the least scholarly can grasp every point at once. The Canon's method, which is to go through the books, taking sections rather than verses at a time, keeps the reader's mind always concentrated upon things of genuine importance; and, from the point of view of the preachers whom he is anxious to help, the perspective is admirable, more attention being paid, for example, to Nehemiah than to Ezra or Chronicles.

Dr. Sell brings to his task a vast array of Oriental learning, which he can use with great illustrative effect, and the books of Ecclesiastes and the Song give him the chance which he is not slow to take: where, for example, other commentators quote Greek, he illuminates his discussion by excerpts from Persian and Arabic poetry. We heartily agree with the Bishop of Dornakel when he says that 'the Indian Church has been fortunate in having had Canon Sell to introduce to it the results of modern research and Biblical scholarship,' and no less fortunate will be those who for the first time are introduced to these results by Dr. Sell's reverent and scholarly volumes.

A FRESH STUDY OF THE APOCALYPSE.

The Message of the Book of Revelation; or, The War of the Lamb, by the Rev. William J. Dey, M.A., D.D. (Oxford University Press; 4s. 6d. net), a posthumous work issued by a son of the author, is the result of work in a study group continued during several summers. The interpretation is based on the sound principle that the primary message of the book was for its first readers, and that the book has an intelligible moral for us

only because it had an intelligible moral for its own time.

The author finds the unity of 'Revelation' in its purpose to show the war being waged by Satan and his Hosts against Christ and His Hosts, a war for the possession of this world whose only end is the final and complete triumph of Christ. He thinks commentators have tended too much to interpret the book as a series of judgments, and have underestimated the significance of the part played by 'the testimony of Jesus Christ' in winning this war for the salvation of the world. 'Our brethren . . . overcame him (their accuser) because of the blood of the Lamb, and because of the word of their testimony' is the text of much of the book.

The plagues associated with the first four trumpets are visitations on the godless world, in answer to 'the prayers of all the saints'; 'not that the Church prayed for judgments; the Church simply prayed "Arise, O God, plead thine own cause," then she left it to God to answer as He saw best.' On 'the oil and the wine hurt thou not' the author comments that during famines in our own day in China and elsewhere 'God's people have almost entirely escaped starvation, while others have died by thousands.'

An introduction by Professor W. Manson, Knox College, Toronto, is a guarantee that we are dealing with an intelligent and reverent study of this difficult portion of Scripture.

The anonymous author of the new *Life and Work of Mary Aikenhead*, 'Foundress of the Congregation of Irish Sisters of Charity' (Longmans; 15s. net), has made it his purpose to give his readers not only a full-length portrait of that remarkable woman, but also full-length portraits of a number of Roman Catholic priests and nuns associated with her in her notable work in Dublin during the early half of last century. As a history, minute in many of its details, of the work of Sisters of Charity who took the vow to devote themselves to labour among the poor, this is a book for Roman Catholic readers. So far as it is the story of the career of a woman of rare capacity in the sphere to which she devoted her life, it is a book of real human interest, and a most interesting record of splendid achievement.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton 'are laying all thoughtful people under a real debt by the issue of their 'Library of Philosophy and Religion.' The new volume on *Idealism as a Philosophical Doctrine*, by Professor R. F. Alfred Hoernlé of Johannesburg (5s. net), is one of the most delightful books in philosophy we have seen for long. The subject itself is fascinating. It is also timely, because the whole trend in philosophy is at present idealistic. But for most ordinary people it is a difficult subject, and these books are written just for ordinary people. Professor Hoernlé's achievement is that on a subject so apparently abstruse he has written a book that any person of average intelligence can understand. But he has done more. Even well-educated people are a little 'wandered' in this field. They know something about Berkeley, less about Hegel, and precious little about Bosanquet and the moderns. What they need is a map to help them to find their way through the 'tangled mazes of idealistic theory.' And here is just what they want. The writer has kept the big main route clear. He has distinguished two types of idealism—that of Berkeley, which interprets reality as a society of spirits; and that of Hegel, which interprets it as appearances of the absolute. There are introductory historical chapters leading up to this and other chapters leading down from it. But this is the main theme, and it is made not only intelligible but extremely pleasant by plain words and (for the most part) good English ('Different than' on p. 97 is a rare lapse).

In the introduction to his latest volume, *There They Crucified Him* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), Dr. John A. Hutton tells this incident. 'Many years ago,' he says, 'my curiosity was excited by observing the electric cars on the streets of a certain city. There was no overhead wire such as I could have understood as the channel for the power that drove those cars. Neither was there any slot in the paved way through which a connection might be maintained with some steady source of power. And yet the cars behaved quite normally. They started, accelerated, halted, according to the will of the driver. On examining the track, I learned the secret. It was this. At intervals of a few yards, among the paved blocks, was one particular block which had a copper knob projecting ever so slightly above the general level. All along

the route were those slightly raised copper-headed blocks. In a moment I saw how the thing was done. Fitted to the car was a kind of metal shoe, which, in passing, grazed the upraised copper-headed block and gathered at the touch a new wave of power. On the strength of that wave the car went forward, and, before the power which it had taken up was exhausted, the car had brushed another knob and was once again revived.

'I believe the system has now been abandoned in favour of the overhead wire with its unremitting stream of power. Which also is a parable!'

So Dr. Hutton's is a volume of addresses for special days. We should not need these special days, but we do need them, and we must observe them so that the whole level of life be not lowered. These addresses are, like all Dr. Hutton's work, very fresh and suggestive.

Dorothy M. Vaughan, M.A., has written for children a book on *Great Peoples of the Ancient World* (Longmans; 3s. 6d.) which can be described as nothing less than fascinating. In successive chapters she presents living pictures of the people of Babylon, Crete, Egypt, the Hittites, Israel, Assyria, and Persia. Her method is to weave the chief facts of the history and of the social life and customs of these peoples into the form of a story, and the facts, which are drawn from a hundred sources—inscriptions, clay-tablets, and what not?—are as reliable as the story is interesting. The conception shows great skill as well as wide knowledge. History would be better known if it were more often as entertainingly told. Happy the children—and the grown-ups too—who get their start in ancient history from such a book as this, adorned as it is with over sixty illustrations.

The addresses delivered at the demonstration in London in 1924 'in support of the Full Inspiration of the Bible' have been published in a small pamphlet under the title *The Facts of Our Faith* (Marshall Brothers; 1s.). The addresses were given by Dr. Dinsdale Young, Principal M'Caig, and others, and the booklet includes the letter of Sir William Ramsay which was widely published at the time. We need do no more than draw attention to the issue of the book. Many people will desire to possess it. We may, however, take the opportunity to commend one of the addresses to our readers for the quite unusual force and

ability of its treatment of an important subject. The Rev. J. Russell Howden, B.D., writes at some length on 'The Historical Basis of Christianity,' and his argument for the historicity of the Resurrection of Christ is a very effective piece of apologetic.

Sir Robert Anderson is a well-known and doughty supporter of tradition. A book of his which won cordial praise from Mr. Gladstone is now republished under the title *A Doubter's Doubts about Science and Religion: or, In Defence, a Plea for the Faith* (Pickering & Inglis; 3s. 6d. net). The 'doubts' are directed to 'new fangled superstitions,' and as a matter of fact the argument is a plea for the old faith. Darwinism, Spencerism, the Higher Criticism, Leslie Stephen's Agnosticism, and other 'new fangled' ideas are passed in review, and a robust traditionalism has a good deal to say for itself in this volume.

Miss Constance L. Maynard is known already for her educational work. She has just published a little book which touches on religious education on one side and Christian mysticism on another: *The Kingdom of Heaven is Like . . .* (R.T.S.; 2s. 6d. net). The book has two parts. One records impressions which Nature may be found to make on an ordinary religious mind. The other contains a series of scientific parables, spiritual significances which appear in Nature to a mind with a certain outfit of elementary science. Both parts are deeply religious in tone and outlook, and will appeal to thoughtful and devotional minds.

There is always a sufficiency of apologetic essays appearing from time to time written from different points of view. A very earnest and capable argument from the 'high-church' standpoint is supplied in *The Mystery of Belief*, by Canon A. R. Whitham (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). The Christian faith supports itself by a twofold witness, spiritual experience and the historic facts from which that experience flows. So the argument runs; but it takes a wider sweep, including hindrances to belief, and helps to belief, the place of the Bible and the place of the Church in the Faith. The writer is broad-minded and wide awake and presents a case which will reinforce the faith of the hesitating and will challenge investigation from any fair opponent.

'Strange and unexpected things often happen in life. What formerly seemed to be quite impossible, in a short time becomes a realized fact. If any one had told me, when I arrived in Ireland in January 1917, a staunch Unitarian minister of fifteen years' standing, that in less than four years I should be a priest of the Holy Catholic Church, I should have laughed at the very absurdity of the idea!' Thus the Rev. G. A. Ferguson begins his account of *How a Unitarian Found the Saviour Christ* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. net). It is a very interesting story. As a piece of spiritual autobiography it is extraordinarily well written. But its main interest lies in the clear account of the point at which Unitarianism failed and the reasons which, step by step, led him into the 'full Christian faith' and 'that free, enlightened, and progressive branch of the Catholic Church,' the Anglican Communion. In both aspects referred to the story forms an excellent piece of Christian apologetic.

Gnosticism is a subject of deep interest. It has so often been misunderstood and misrepresented, that adequate appreciation of what it really was might be taken as a test of one's competency to speak on early Church history. Means of learning about it have recently been notably increased. No one who wishes to increase his knowledge of the subject can afford to dispense with *Pistis Sophia—Literally translated from the Coptic*, by George Horner, with an introduction by F. Legge, F.S.A. (S.P.C.K.; 16s. net).

We have nothing but praise for *The Lady Julian: A Psychological Study*, by Mr. R. H. Thouless, M.A., Ph.D. (S.P.C.K.; 4s. 6d. net). Readers will find here all the penetrating psychological analysis and literary felicity which marked the author's previous work. It is worth while to learn about the Lady Julian, the Norwich mystic of the fourteenth-fifteenth century. It is perhaps even more valuable to get the shrewd and sympathetic exposition of mystical religion which is here supplied. A spot on the sun!—we doubt whether ' anchoress ' is the feminine of ' anchorite,' and still more strongly whether ' anchorage ' is the name of her abode.

Miss Lily Dougall's death is a loss to many causes and not least to Christian thinking. Her inspiration was to be traced in some of the most widely read of the 'group' books produced in the

last few years, and her own work is not by any means negligible. Before her death she was engaged on a new book, and the substance of it is presented in *God's Way with Man* (S.C.M. ; 4s. net). The sub-title is 'an exploration of the method of the Divine Working suggested by the facts of history and science,' and this points to the main problem in view. Miss Dougall was evidently oppressed by the burden of one great difficulty, that of suffering and natural 'accidents,' and this is discussed in a most illuminating way in this volume. The solution suggested is the limitation set for Divine action not only by free-will but by the brute fact of Nature. This and the love of God which shares the trouble of man afford at least some relief from the weight of the problem. The book is a helpful contribution to a hard question. In addition to these essays, however, there is a delightful sketch of the author from the pen of Canon Streeter who edits the volume.

'All knowledge of truth, historical and scientific, æsthetic and psychological, is in the last resort knowledge of God, of the Power behind phenomena, of the spirit which works in man. I do not believe that there is such a thing as secular education worthy of the name. It would be possible to organise schools on a materialistic basis, which is, I imagine, what the advocates of secular education really want, by securing the co-operation of teachers who all held this point of view, and omitting from the curriculum all subjects which could not be handled and explained on this basis. Merely to omit or prohibit religious instruction cannot make a school secular, unless all the teachers are secularists.' This is from *The Faith of a Teacher*, by Miss Fanny Street, M.A., a paper-covered little book issued by the Student Christian Movement (2s. net). It is a very interesting treatment of the whole subject of education dealing with education as the development of individual personality and also as a social discipline. The school as a community, as a medium of instruction, and as a training ground are the topics of successive chapters, and the teacher himself comes up for survey at the end. Many important topics are included in this survey besides the religious element in education, and as the writer is an expert the book is suggestive and illuminating.

Really good books on prayer are few. Here is

one which will repay study—*Prayer in Christian Theology: A Study of Some Moments and Masters of the Christian Life, from Clement of Alexandria to Fénelon*, by the Rev. A. L. Lilley, M.A. (S.C.M. ; 4s. net).

The many friends of the late Rev. W. D. Miller, minister of the United Free Church at Ruchill, who died last summer, will read with interest *Miller of Ruchill: The Story of a Great Achievement*, by Mr. J. Sommerville Smith, M.A. (Thomson & Cowan ; 3s. 6d. net). They who knew him best will feel most keenly the fault of the book—its lack of perspective. As a lovable, earnest minister, enthusiastic in his zeal, untiring in his energies, Miller was typical of many in the ministry ; not so exceptional as this book would lead one to believe. We have here fresh and convincing proof that no biography should be written too soon after the demise of its subject.

'Tracts for the Times' are being issued by the Teachers and Taught publishing house at three-pence each. They are apologetic and expository booklets. We have received the first seven: *A Conversation about God, Justice and Mercy, Why did Jesus Die? About the Future Life, Why Read the Old Testament? Faith and Belief, and A Talk about Forgiveness*. The writers are the Rev. W. F. Halliday, M.A., and the Rev. W. F. Harvey, M.A., M.B., the Rev. W. F. Lofthouse, M.A., D.D., the Rev. H. C. Carter, M.A., the Rev. James Reid, M.A., of Eastbourne, and the Rev. Nathaniel Micklem, M.A. The aim of the tracts is to re-interpret the Christian Religion in a living way to this generation. The writers are drawn from different churches, and the presentation is that of the common intelligent faith of enlightened minds to-day.

The Church and its Mission, by the Rev. Charles C. Whiting, M.A., B.D. (published by the author, Nesbitt, Manitoba, Canada ; \$1.00 in cloth, 60 cts. in paper covers), is an exposition of the nature and real mission of the Church. The writer believes that the knowledge of this is all that is needed to lead believing people to do more for the Church and the cause it represents, and so the influence of the Church would rapidly increase. The book is a really intelligent and comprehensive treatment of its great subject on all its sides, and is eminently worthy of a warm reception on this side of the water

as well as on its own. The whole theme is excellently conceived, divided, and expounded.

The Hulsean Lectures for 1920-1921 were delivered by the Rev. P. N. Waggett, M.A., D.D., who chose for his subject *Knowledge and Virtue* (Clarendon Press; 10s. 6d. net). 'I had been in the way of seeing a good deal, during the six years 1914-20, of what can be done by violence of different kinds; and something of what can be done only by persuasion, conviction, illumination, and the other processes which we think of as more especially of the mind. I wished, therefore, as I had been allowed the advantage of the University Pulpit, to add my voice to the happily growing chorus of voices raised on behalf of thought and against force.' This is the motive behind the lectures. There are many people impatient of the slow way. They want to get 'to business' and do something. Dr. Waggett believes in the slower way. He believes in the mind, and especially in the soul. All kinds of knowledge get their due here and are welcomed. But the lectures end on the deepest note and lead up to the knowledge of God in which alone, or above all else, lies the hope of the world. There is a very beautiful spirit in these pages. Perhaps that is their chief gift. The argument is sound if some-

times a little vague. But the plea itself and the noble vision of the pleader will leave a deep impression on the reader.

An excellent popular book on Christian Ethics has been written by Professor Gerald B. Smith and published by the University of Chicago Press (\$2.00), to which we owe many admirable publications, especially in the field of religious education. *The Principles of Christian Living* is not a text-book. It is too unconventional and vital for any such description. It is a very careful and frank discussion of the nature, the basis, and the applications of the Christian Ethic. The writer keeps close to facts and experience, and expounds the relation of Christianity to life in an independent and always interesting fashion. The foundation is well and truly laid, and on this he builds his view of the family, the Church, politics, industrial problems, possessions, and recreations. Two features are worthy of special mention—a good bibliography is appended to every chapter, and a series of questions is given for discussion. These are not perfunctory or a mere summary of the chapter. They are almost more interesting than the exposition itself. The book is so good that it should circulate widely, especially in student circles.

Buddhism and Christianity.

By KENNETH J. SAUNDERS, M.A., PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA.

I.

SOME RECENT BOOKS.

THE Buddhism of the Pali Canon is the Buddhism which has almost monopolized the attention of Western scholarship. It is the Buddhism of monks, wholly concerned with the search for Release from Rebirth: most of it seems to be the Buddhism of men who have lost the glamour of the great days of the Faith. It is surely a more negative and pessimistic thing than the religion of the Founder, and it reflects only in occasional passages the religion of the masses, who are not concerned with Release but with happiness now and a good rebirth hereafter.

This distinction is admirably worked out by Dr. Paul Oltramare in his *Théosophie Bouddhique*,¹ which is the second part of a larger work, and has already been reviewed in this Magazine. While recognizing the distinction, however, Dr. Oltramare ends his book with the harsh words, 'the ideal of Buddhism is a cruel mutilation of man.' These words will be eagerly quoted; yet they are not true of the Buddhism of great laymen like Asoka, which was positive and full-orbed in its internationalism and in its social ethic. Nor are they true of the lay Buddhism which developed into the Mahāyāna, and became the vessel in which the great gifts of Indian civilization passed on to China, Korea, and

¹ Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1923.

Japan. This new Buddhism, claiming to be truer to the spirit of Sākya-muni, put service to mankind before personal salvation, and promised all men Buddhahood. It held out alluring visions of Paradise, and made faith in a personal Buddha the way of salvation. Here was a Buddhism which proved a successful rival to Vaishnavite and Saivite Hinduism, and which captured the masses of the Far East. The Sākya-muni of the *Lotus* and the Amitābha of the *Paradise Scriptures* are worthy rivals of Krishna, and met a long-felt need in China and Japan for a personal Deity of love and compassion. Side by side with these popular manifestations—which are well traced and set side by side with the philosophical schools in Dr. Masson Oursel's admirable *Esquisse*,¹ a work which with the larger volumes of Dr. Oltramare enhance the already great reputation of French scholarship in this field—there went on the elaborate psychological analysis of men like Buddhaghosa in the South, and Vasubandhu in the North. Our knowledge of these two great men is considerably advanced by two new works, that of Mr. B. C. Law² upon *Buddhaghosa*, and that of Dr. Stcherbatsky, *The Central Conception of Buddhism*.³ These are of great value to the advanced student, and a mere glance at them ought to make it clear to the intelligent lay reader that here is Buddhist scholasticism concerning itself with psychological and ontological questions quite beyond the range of the masses in any Buddhist sect, and indeed capable of being understood by only a few specialists among the monks. The two commentaries here studied, the *Visuddhimagga* of Buddhaghosa and the *Abhidharmakosa* of Vasubandhu are indeed great and epoch-making works, but they have hardly affected the Buddhism of the masses. Scholars will be grateful for these works, and for the great number of other people interested in Buddhism they will at least serve to show that its thinkers were systematic and profound! All these books are indications of a new and more scientific study of Buddhism; and remind us how impressive and varied are its forms, and how deep a gulf separates its masses from its philosophers, and even its monks. These reflections are of much more practical consequence than they may seem. The missionary, for example, who deals hardly at all with the monk and almost never with

the Buddhist philosopher, though he would do well to remember that these are human too, has to keep his eye on the laity. Even in Burma and Ceylon, which are the homes and fastnesses of Theravāda orthodoxy, the people are not seeking Nirvana, but a good rebirth, here or in heaven: they are concerned not at all with the difficult practices of meditation prescribed by Buddhaghosa, nor with the psychological analysis of Vasubandhu, nor must it be confessed are they greatly interested in the lofty ethical tenets of the Founder. Theirs is a Buddhism like that of the masses in the Far East, in that they pray for temporal blessings for themselves and their dear ones, whether living or dead, and dimly worship the Great Hero who in many lives has acquired merit for them and suffered for their salvation. In a word, most Buddhists are normal human beings, and the austere monastic ideal does not appeal to them.

To whom, then, will they listen? Not much to the monk, who usually confines himself to asking their support or to reciting passages of scripture which they do not understand, or to preaching to them of the simpler things of the lay ideal. They clearly do not listen very much to the foreign missionary in these days of acute nationalism; and even the foreigner dressed in the guise of a Buddhist monk leaves them cold. Only an Oriental saint, to whom Buddhism or Christianity means a life of power and selflessness, will compel their attention; only one, in a word, who 'brings them the water of life in an eastern vessel.' The phrase is that of Sadhu Sundar Singh, and of course one thinks of him at his great task of teaching an Indian Christianity, or of Toyshiko Kagawa at his heroic task of 'Human Architecture' in Japan. These two, young, ardent, devoted, Oriental Christians without denominational bias, appeal to Young Asia as prophets of the New Day. Mr. Kagawa has recently baptized thousands, and is the despair of the reactionary forces of militarism and imperialism. Sundar Singh has gone like a flame through India in his yellow robe of the ascetic. These men are thinkers and theologians as well as evangelists and builders. The Sadhu preaches a Christianity which he incarnates in a life of simplicity and unselfishness, and formulates in the phraseology of the *Bhagavad Gītā*. Mr. Kagawa, also embracing poverty, and living in the slums with his beloved people, preaches a Christianity which has affinities with the Buddhism of the *Lotus* Scripture. They hold up a beloved

¹ *Esquisse d'une Histoire de la Philosophie Indienne*; Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1923.

² Calcutta: Thacker, Spink & Co., 1924.

³ R.A.S. Publication Fund, 1923.

Lord, who demands whole-hearted loyalty, but who offers to his devotees the gifts of peace and immortality and the Divine Presence which the masses of Hindus and Buddhists have so eagerly sought. All the words he uses are the familiar words of Hindu Bhakti, and Christianity is seen, at last, in India as in Japan, in Oriental dress.

It is rather tragic, then, to find the Christian Church in Ceylon, which is making no numerical progress, and indeed is slightly smaller than it was in 1871, coming to the conclusion, as its Report¹ says 'with impressive unanimity,' that 'Christian preaching in a Buddhist country cannot build on Buddhism and present Christianity as its crown.' To the findings of this devoted group of foreign missionaries and Ceylonese Christians we shall devote our next article. In the meantime let it be stated at once that their task in Ceylon, like that of the Church in Burma, is a peculiarly difficult one, and that among the Burmese also Christianity seems to make little progress.

II.

SOME PRACTICAL PROBLEMS.

The Christian Council of Ceylon, which met this autumn, discussed the topic of this paper with great earnestness. Between fifty and sixty Christian leaders were present, and many of them belonged to the country. Some at any rate could claim to know Buddhism from within. Their findings therefore are of interest and of value. Among them are the following opinions:

1. That Buddhism, which for centuries has left God out of account, and which offers no real spiritual experience, has produced a state of mind which makes the acceptance of Christianity peculiarly difficult.

2. That among the main hindrances to the acceptance of Christianity by Buddhists are (a) lack of belief in a Supreme Deity, (b) the belief that Buddhism is the national religion, and the failure to grasp the fact that Christianity is capable of national expression.

3. That, owing to the agnostic outlook of Buddhism, such points of contact as there are, such as renunciation and ethical similarities, are necessarily superficial.

It was the opinion of the Conference also that

converts gained a first impression of Christianity as a religion supplying something which they realized to be lacking in Buddhism. Forgiveness, prayer, and power to be good are instances given: and the Conference was of opinion that 'the Gospel of Jesus Christ is so absolutely different from anything in Buddhism that it should be presented directly, and as an entirely new message.'

In contrast to all this are the findings with respect to Hinduism: 'We should seek points of contact with the Hindu mind. Comparison of Hindu doctrine with Christian doctrine is generally not helpful, but without question the message of the Gospel should be adapted to the religious outlook of the people.'

In a word, we get the impression that Buddhism has made it much harder for a man to accept Christ than has Hinduism. With all its glaring faults, the uncleanness of many of its temples, its polytheism and polydemonism, its support of the abuses of the caste system, it seems that popular Hinduism has yet more vital points of contact with Christianity than Buddhism, which arose as a moral reform and a protest against these abuses. Yet before such a conclusion is fairly reached, there are many other questions which have to be answered. Are the Sinhalese, who are mostly Buddhists, more anti-foreign than the Hindus in Ceylon, who are mostly Tamils? Are the missionaries sure that this agnostic Buddhism which they describe is really that of the villagers? Have they fully distinguished between arguing about Buddhism and Christianity and preaching a Christianity which is indeed positive and unique and yet expresses itself in terms familiar and dear to their Buddhist hearers? One would at any rate hope that they have all read some of the books we have already discussed in this article. They would find especially valuable the brilliant little work entitled *Buddhism and Christianity*, by Dr. Estlin Carpenter,² who is almost unique in being equally distinguished as a scholar in both fields. Out of his great learning and deep sympathy Dr. Carpenter speaks, to remind us that the roots of these great religions go down deep into the common soil of human thought and experience. He quotes the great words of Professor Troeltsch, 'in our earthly experience the divine Life is not One but Many. But to discover the One in the Many is the special task of love.' Dr. Carpenter shows us, in fact, in many a brilliant and detailed summary, how

¹ Findings of the Christian Council Conference, Ceylon, September 1924.

² Hodder & Stoughton, 1923.

the two great religions, differing as they often do, are yet expressions of human need; and the missionary in Burma and Ceylon continually needs to remind himself that the Buddhism, even of the monks, is part of a greater Buddhism which has developed in other lands along lines strangely similar to those of Christianity. If Buddhists of the more negative type were won in large numbers to the doctrine of salvation by faith in a personal Saviour, they may be again so won. But to win them will need a prophet of their own people who to their agnosticism, if they have it, will offer the glowing and radiant certainty of a first-hand experience like that of Sundar Singh and Kagawa, and who will know how to express the hidden life of the soul in a theological form which is not a reproduction of the Hebrew-Roman-Greek-Teutonic Christianity which we have introduced, but which is of the soil, and which has its roots in the past religious experience of the race. The central task of the missionary body is to win and train such a native leader, and then to give him a free hand. Mr. Kagawa was won to Christ because of the brotherly love of a missionary family, and Sadhu Sundar Singh because of the devoted life of another missionary. The only mistake which is really unpardonable in the missionary of to-day is to seek to do the work of evangelism himself. This mistake the great pioneers, Carey in India and Morrison in China, refused to make. Have we fallen from grace? Those missionaries who are building up training colonies like that of Mr. Gibson in Ceylon, or that of the American Baptists in Burma, deserve the support of the whole Church: and out of them it may be that the great national leaders so urgently needed in these countries will arise. In the meantime a thorough sympathetic and intimate study of the older religions of Asia is of vital importance. As Sundar Singh knows the *Gītā*, and Kagawa the great Buddhist books, so must the future leaders of Christianity in Ceylon and Burma be steeped in the Buddhist heritage of these countries. Negative as it may seem now, Buddhism has after all been the great civilizing influence in these lands, and I am

not sure that to a sympathetic eye it will not yet reveal itself as more positive and more capable of meeting religious needs than the findings of the Christian Council suggest. The task it confesses of producing a Christianity 'that shall not seem exotic has yet to be solved.' It is a very great and inspiring task, and those who are working at it deserve our respect, our support, and our prayers.

Their task is of such vital importance that constructive criticism is always welcome to them. Most of them will be asking themselves if their training colleges for Oriental Christians are in any sufficient sense union enterprises. They will not wish to go on asking the Buddhists of Ceylon, with their strong sense of nationalism, to become Church of England Christians: their hearts and minds go out to the Chinese who objected to being labelled a 'Dutch Reformed American Chinese Christian.' The objection is so real that no effort should be spared in releasing a strong man from each mission to do this indispensable work in a united training college in each field.

The missionary bodies again must go back to the giant pioneers Carey, Morrison, Judson, Gogerly, who realized the vast importance of Christian literature. To this the Report calls attention. Very modestly it urges the early provision of 'a special missionary for literary work.' Surely a group is needed, foreigners of high training and Asiatic leaders of proved ability, to work out together the Christian apologetic, and the many forms of literature needed by the young Church. Conference after conference calls attention to this need, and every other interest is allowed in practice to come first. Perhaps it would not be amiss to make it widely known that there are research fellowships for missionaries on furlough at Union Theological College in New York, and a fellowship in literature for an Oriental at the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California. To produce worth-while books needs a studious atmosphere, the contact of other minds with similar interests, and a library such as is not often available to the man on the spot with many duties crowding upon him.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Blackies and Nightingales.¹

'And they sung as it were a new song . . . and no man could learn that song but the hundred and forty and four thousand, which were redeemed from the earth.'—Rev 14³.

HAVE you heard the nightingales over the wireless, or did Mother bundle you off to bed? Ah, well, bed is very fine and cosy, once you are really in it! But the nightingales were very interesting too—to hear what has never been heard before up here in Scotland, to listen to a tiny brown bird no bigger than a sparrow pouring out its song away down in some wood in Surrey, just as if you were standing there beside it, it was very wonderful! And yet, if you were up and had the phones on, weren't you just a teeny-weeny bittie disappointed? I was. It seemed very like a blackie. And I think a blackie can hold up its head. The nightingale has more notes and cleverer trills, and it is mellower, they tell me. And yet—I don't know what I had expected, but the men in the poetry books have said so much about the nightingale, that I had an idea that its song was somehow altogether different from other birds', something quite new. And it isn't. It is just the same thing, only better done.

And isn't that a mistake that we are often making? We think that things are quite different, and they aren't. They are just the same, only better done. The Lord Jesus Christ was once a laddie like you. Oh! not like me, you say. But yes, He was. He had a life just like yours, with the same little duties, the very same things to be done. For Him; too, bedtime often came when He wasn't one bit sleepy; and some nights there were lessons when the sun outside was very tempting; and often He had thought of doing something, but when the time came Joseph looked tired, and so instead He offered to help in the workshop; or Mary was dreadfully busy, and He took the little ones and kept them happy. It was just your life, only it was better done. I remember once in Glasgow saying something like that about Jesus and His lessons. And a clever woman who was in the church, a person who writes books, wrote to

the paper saying it was scandalous. She thought the nightingale was somehow altogether different from other birds, but it isn't; that Jesus wasn't a real boy like you, and yet He was. Only He did it better. When bedtime came He went off without the wheedling and the uproar that you make, when lesson time came round stuck in to them and did them thoroughly, played with the wee ones even when He was getting big Himself, and wasn't cross or crabbed over it as you are who let them see you only do it because you have been told, are bored, and won't really pretend, and spoil it all. He was by far the happiest of them all. It was the same thing as you have to do, only He did it better.

And that is what it means to be good. You think of that as something you could never be, that is only for grown-ups, Dad, or Mother, or a minister, not for a rough-and-tumble little soul like you. Ah! but it is. For goodness isn't something dreadfully difficult, and different from anything you know, like the Latin that they do up at the top of the school, but which is not for you at all. No, no! goodness is just doing what you have to do, but doing it better. At games, if that old trouble about l.b.w. crops up, and you feel certain your leg wasn't in front at all, never mind; if the others think it was, go out and grin about it and don't make a fuss. Or if your innings is over and you are set to field, don't lose interest in the game, and take to playing with a dog, so that they have to yell to you when the ball comes in your direction, and point out where about it is, and get quite hot and cross about it, and no wonder! I am sure that Jesus was picked early when they did their 'eenie meenie' long ago in Nazareth, because they knew He would do His best for the side, and play His hardest all the time. And when there is a chance of being greedy and grabby, and you feel so inclined to cry out 'Me first,' don't; but let the wee ones have a chance of choosing what they want, even though you are bigger. And at home be sunny and happy. Mother does a lot for you. Well, let her hear that you are having a good time. And long after this, when you are grown up and away, or perhaps have gone farther still, she will sometimes say to Dad, 'I sometimes

¹ By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

think I can still hear him singing through the house, as he always used to do.' The song of the nightingale isn't something different from all the other birds', but just the same thing, only better done; and goodness is just your day, with its joys and troubles, better done. Here we are told that up in heaven they sing a new song no one else can sing. The sparrow cannot learn to sing like a nightingale, no, nor a blackie either; but you and I can learn that song they sing up yonder. For heaven isn't a place where we all get whatever we like; it's where no one is cross or grumpy or selfish or unkind; and that is why they are so happy and keep singing. It is just our kind of life, only they live it better. And if we are ever to sing that wonderful song of theirs, we must begin to learn it now; and if we are ever to be happy as they are, we must start putting off all silly, angry, sulky ways. That is what goodness means. The wonderful nightingale sings very like a blackie, but it does it better.

Cross Words.¹

'How forcible are right words.'—Job 6.²⁵

I want to speak to you about cross words. Don't misunderstand me. I don't mean angry words. I mean cross words in puzzles. You know! The sort of thing you find in nearly all the papers. Even some fathers are sitting up at night wrestling with them, and some mothers, as they do their household work, are wondering how they can find the name of a Cossack chief that will fit in with the name of a lake in Ireland, and at the same time supply a letter for the name of a town in Japan.

Girls and boys are trying to win prizes with their solutions. It is quite a fascinating game. It isn't bad either, because those who play it are refreshing their memories and learning how to spell.

I think that cross-word puzzles are something like life. In life you often get very different things mixed up with each other. People from the other side of the world may influence your home. Things you have never thought of may be affecting your life. If you are to live properly you have to be experts at cross words.

1. Take the word MINE. You know what that means: there is something that belongs to you.

¹ By the Reverend Cecil Nicholson, Darwen.

You say, 'This is mine.' It pleases you to say that. Now what word will cross with 'Mine'?

H

I think of one: HIS. Try them: MINE
S

One of the things we have to learn, even when we are little, is how to cross 'His' with 'Mine.' I know a little boy called Jack. He is only about six, but being the only child in the house, he has quite a lot of toys. He has a little friend called Andrew, and Andrew is one of three children, and he has not so many toys, and Andrew does not know that 'His' crosses 'Mine,' because, when Jack is not looking, he will cram some of Jack's toys into his pockets to take them home.

Jack found this out, and he did not like it. He is only six, but he is a kind little boy, and is not at all unwilling to give his toys, but he does not like them to be taken. So what do you think he does? He searches Andrew's pockets before he goes home.

One of the things we have to learn and carry out in life is that the word 'His' crosses the word 'Mine.' That, whilst we have our rights, the other boys and girls and men and women have their rights too, and we have to learn how to fit them into the great cross puzzle of life.

2. Take another. Look at the short word 'On.' Think of another short word that crosses it. Here it is: 'No.' In life we have often to cross the word 'On' with the word 'No.' ON
O Many

people think that what they have to do in life is to get on, on with their learning, on with their play, on with their business, always getting on, getting richer, cleverer, bigger. Get on! That is their great idea. Ah! sometimes we must say 'No' to things that look like getting on.

I knew a boy who, when he grew to be a young man, went to take a situation in Russia, and he came to be trusted by his employers. After some years they brought him to England, to help and advise them about buying a lot of machinery. They went to one great workshop, and the heads of the firm drew the young man aside, and said: 'If we get the order, there is £500 for you.'

That looked like 'getting on.' £500 for a young man with his way to make, and a home to make, and a girl waiting for him to make it. Ah! but this young man had been brought up in a Christian home and a Christian Sunday school, and he knew

that the machinery at that place was not quite the best, and he said 'No.'

You will find as you get older that the word 'No' has often to be fitted to the word 'On' in the great cross puzzle of life.

3. Just one more. Take a longer word this time. The word FRIEND. That is a beautiful word, and it stands for one of the best things in life. A friend: one who loves you, knows you and yet likes you, and will stick to you. 'Stick to thy friend though he be in the fire' is a proverb amongst the Arabs, and it is a very good one, and if you have got a friend in the world who will do that, you are very lucky indeed.

Can we find a friend like that? Let us see if crossing will help us. F, R, I, E. There is something sounds like E. Try J. J, E. That is it. The first syllable of Jesus. Like this:

J
FRIEND
S
U
S

The best friend to have is Jesus. He can do more for you. He can make you happier than any one else can. Make Him your friend and stick to Him, and He will stick to you all through life, and right on to the end of the world.

The Christian Year.

SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT.

He must needs Suffer.

'Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory?'—Lk 24²⁶.

There is more in this conversation on the road to Emmaus than at first meets the eye. Cleopas and his friend may well be taken as types, and while they speak for themselves they speak also for multitudes of men and women since their day. They had shared the opinion of many other Jews in their time that Jesus of Nazareth might be the Messiah. They had at least hoped that it had been He who should have redeemed Israel, and the news of His trial, condemnation, and death had come upon them as a shock. Their hopes were dashed to the ground. They could no longer believe in Jesus as the Christ. The cross was an offence to them. And it is an offence that never ceases. The mystery of the sacrifice of Jesus

continually blinds men's eyes. The secret of the salvation which is in Jesus is continually evading us—we find it hard to conform our ideas to God's.

Here, then, is the question before us, not a riddle for our solution, but a deep and solemn challenge to our better selves, a call to believe in the absolute fitness and justice of God's way with men in Jesus Christ, His Son—Was there not a moral obligation upon Him to suffer?

And in order fairly to discuss the question we must be quite clear as to what it was that Jesus Christ came into the world to do. Students of mankind tell us that, roughly speaking, three stages may be distinguished in the history of human progress: (1) the stage of barbarism, when the body is cultivated; (2) the stage of civilization, when the mind is cultivated; (3) the stage of religion, when the soul is cultivated. Now the coming of Jesus marks the dominance of this last stage. He has to do with the soul first, and opens to men that larger life which we call spiritual. True, He profoundly affects the physical and intellectual life, and His teaching has its social and moral aspects; but that is because He goes first to the root of the matter, and touches man at the core and centre of his being.

And the work of Jesus with the human soul was not merely to educate, but to save it.

And what men need to do to-day is still to accept the moral and judicial necessity for the sufferings and sacrifice of Jesus Christ, but no longer to express it in legal phraseology, but in terms of spiritual life.

In seeking to do this, let us look at the sufferings of Jesus, (1) in the light of His relation to men. There is no name more characteristic of Him, and none which He Himself more frequently used, than the title 'Son of Man.' Jesus never anywhere explains this name, but as we study sympathetically His use of it we cannot miss the deep undercurrent of its meaning. It signifies His solidarity with the race, and it gives to His humanity a representative and, if you will, a vicarious character. But there is more in it than this. It means that He stood frankly for the human race and identified Himself with outraged human interests. His relation with men was not in any sense official, but one of simple human fellowship. And the aim of this fellowship was apparent. It was that He might raise men to His own level, lift them above the miserable contradictions of the flesh and the spirit, change the

discord of their being into harmony, and help them to share His nature and His life. As the Son of Man Jesus set before the world a lofty and still unattained ideal. His life gave practical expression to a doctrine of humanity such as few philanthropists have ever reached. He made it possible for every sufferer to say :

This fleshly robe the Lord did wear :

This watch the Lord did keep :

These burdens sore the Lord did bear :

These tears the Lord did weep.

And because He suffered He was forced by the folly and prejudice of the day to share the lot of those for whom and with whom He stood.

And when we realize the sense of a unique relationship with mankind which lay upon Jesus, sometimes as a burden, sometimes as a holy joy, and when we add to this His nature, sensitive beyond the common and quick to know what was in man, we may well believe that the spectacle of human sin and misery which met Him at every turn here on earth made no small part of the cup of bitterness He had to drink.

It may be that this formed only part of His suffering, and that it did not necessarily exhaust His love ; but we shall never realize what that love involved until we see that it was sympathy with human woes and needs which led Christ to share them. For we cannot read the Gospels carefully without understanding that there is indicated in them a certain unknown, mysterious element in His sufferings. Apart from the last agony His lot was not a specially hard one. True, He was despised and rejected of those He came to save, and He knew the meaning of poverty and toil. But in this experience there was nothing unique, nothing to account for the burden that He evidently bore. This arose—partly, at least—from His sense of oneness with men and from the grave responsibility which that involved. To Him it meant, from the first, sacrifice. He could never escape the sound of human sorrow.

But there was more in His suffering than this. The moral necessity laid on Jesus Christ cut deeper than this. If there is any meaning in words we have His own testimony for so saying ; and we are bound to ask further, What was the work, and what were the conditions which made this submission to suffering necessary ? What more was behind it than a mere moral impression and the sacrifice

of a natural love ? We can gather some hint of the answer to the question from the words 'and to enter into his glory.' He was not content until He should have finished the work of saving men from their sins. This was what He came to do, and it was for doing this that He needs must suffer.

Now we must ask ourselves here to look at the whole matter as with the eyes of Christ, from the standpoint of the love of God.

The great mass of the religious ceremonies of the world have had for their object the quieting of conscience, the winning by some strange device of that peace and pardon for which the instinct of man has ever told him no price was too great to pay. The ritual and sacrifice which play so large a part in all the religions of the world simply shadow forth the long-drawn agony of the human conscience, the passionate desire to escape the stain and consequences of sin. Now in speaking of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ we generally seek to explain it from the side of God. It is the outcome of God's grace. He willed it so ; it was the work of His good pleasure. That is true, but there is another side to the picture. We must not forget that it is demanded also by the conscience of man. The 'needs must' in the suffering of Jesus means that nothing short of this could satisfy the clamant needs of man's moral and spiritual nature. Given a real and keen sense of sin, and man knows that forgiveness is no child's play. To say that God forgives weakly, as one who would hush the matter up and say no more about it, is to attribute to Him what has been called the 'asses' milk of human kindness.' In our heart of hearts we have nothing but contempt for action such as this, and, what is more, we know that it does not and cannot satisfy our need. Conscience is, above all things, inexorably just. It is a commonplace to say that men will always be more severe with themselves than they are with one another. We pay no small tribute to the real grandeur of our human nature when we say that a man who is in his right mind will never receive forgiveness and the remission of his fault till full restitution has been made. And for all we may say to the contrary, man feels this most keenly where God is concerned. He is not content to think that his forgiveness comes spontaneously when he has paid his price, or made his prayer, as though the universe were an automatic machine. And the one difference between Christianity and all other religions is, that while they make man

pay the whole price for his wrong-doing, in Christianity the price is paid by God.

In the past man has made almost superhuman efforts to atone for wrong done and guilt incurred. He has not even hesitated to give the fruit of his body for the sin of his soul. And for all that he has not won peace, and the story of his struggle for it is a long wail of despair. Now he has still to pay. The consequences of sin are not to be escaped; it can still wreck bodies and blight lives, and wreak inefaceable mischief, but it need not kill the soul. The last agony of it is removed, and the crushing sense of guilt, the burden of conscience, the quenching of hope, once inevitable, are no longer necessary. The reason for this is not that man's quest has succeeded at last, but that God has taken His place and achieved the impossible for him. And this again completes the answer to the question, 'Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory?'¹

THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT.

Redeeming the Time.

'Redeeming the time, because the days are evil.'—Eph 5¹⁶.

The passage of time is one of those things which are much talked about, but in practice a great deal overlooked. It is with a start of surprise, like some suddenly waked sleeper, that we realize from one year to another how quickly and silently our span is being measured. The season of childhood and youth may seem long enough while it lasts, and the child may heave many a sigh for the coming of riper age. But when that age of maturity is reached, the feeling is certain to arise—'How quickly time has fled!'

George Eliot, in one of the essays of 'Theophrastus Such,' has painted, with all her own keenness of insight and boldness of portraiture, the delusive sense of youthfulness in which some men spend a large part of their life. She takes the case of some one whose talents as a youth and young man have won the delighted plaudits of surprised observers. He carries off the chief prizes at school and college, although he is 'so young'! He makes a brilliant appearance in literature or in public work, although he is 'so young'! This idea of juvenility at length becomes part of his own self-consciousness. He is in no haste to do anything

great, because he is 'so young'! And yet, alas! the un pitying hand of time, scarcely noticed by himself, has been tracing its usual marks of advancing age on his person and mind. Some sad day, the comfortable fancy of perpetual youth is shattered, and he suddenly feels that he is no longer young.

The text is a warning against letting our time lapse from us carelessly, so that age or serious changes come on us unawares. The writer exhorts Christian people to redeem the time. When he uses that special word he is thinking of the market with its commodities laid out for sale. The wise merchant does not linger at home during marketing hours, but hastens to mingle with the busy throng, and to buy up those articles that offer him a particular advantage. It is this promptness and activity that we are urged to apply to our general life. Our time is something that must be redeemed, turned to account by special effort, not suffered to pass from us unheeded. In itself, time may be utterly worthless to us: it may leave us neither wiser nor better than it found us; but if we gain and use its possibilities, it may enrich us beyond our hopes. And let it be observed that to turn our life to account, we must make an effort. Let us cast off the drowsy robe of discontented dreaming, and take a manful part in every daily duty. If our life is to be made interesting, we must labour and struggle, as well as wait. Those moments spent in dull complaints and weary longings are so much precious time unredeemed, and never to be bought back.

And further, let it be observed that time and opportunity are things to be purchased. They can be won only at a certain cost. Time is like an investment yielding pecuniary interest. What we get back from it depends on the amount we put into it.

And in order to buy we must have something to spend. If our brain and heart are empty, as our hands are idle, we cannot fairly complain of our failure to secure bargains. Too often, on the other hand, an opportunity meets us in the face, and we shrink from the cost of making it our own. How much better men and women we should be to-day if only we had had the courage, at some bygone time, to forsake all and follow Christ, to spend ourselves in some supreme effort of the soul, to imitate the apostle whose life-story is summed up in his own burning words—'What things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ!' But

¹ W. B. Selbie, *The Servant of God*, 135.

we shrank from the cost; the happy opportunity flew past us; and our life is all the poorer and feebler now.

Nor must we excuse ourselves by pretending that such critical opportunities were beyond our reach and strength. Look back to the memorable time when you felt in your conscience that heavenly love held out its hand to you, and would have caught you up above your own mean and frivolous life, but that you drew back. Was it, after all, a great cost or a mighty effort which God demanded of you then? No: it was only to yield yourself to His love, only to make one little step forward to meet a Father's embrace. The opportunity passed; has it returned since with equal reality and power?

And if such prompt and active effort be needful at all seasons, it is specially called for when 'the days are evil.' It is then, in days of darkness, sorrow, and defeat, that we are specially tempted to let ourselves drift we care not whither. While our life is fairly happy and successful, while we have our loved ones near us, while the aching void of sorrow and loneliness is still unfelt, men may more easily redeem the time. All is interesting and pleasing at such periods. The days seem too short for happy work and affectionate intercourse. But parting and grief and misfortune will come, and the days will seem dark and evil. The terrible words of ancient denunciation will come true—'In the morning thou shalt say, Would God it were even! and at even thou shalt say, Would God it were morning! for the fear of thine heart wherewith thou shalt fear, and for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see.' In such seasons of darkness above all, we must redeem the time—redeem it from idle regrets and vain longings, from selfish and benumbing grief, from morbid apprehensions. For even the saddest times are full of blessing, bought, it may be, with tears and anguish, but destined to yield, somewhere and somehow, a rich harvest of peace.¹

FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Perils of Routine.

'But Peter said, Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten anything that is common and unclean.'—Ac 10¹⁴.

1. *The Significance of the Vision.*—The story of this vision is deemed worthy of insertion in this

¹ H. M. B. Reid, in *Sub Corona*, 243.

book because it was pregnant with results for the future development of Christianity. Christianity has always had to 'live dangerously.' But the deadliest menace of all threatened it while it was still in its cradle. That menace was that it should never become a universal religion at all, but should degenerate into an obscure Jewish sect. We speak of Paul as the Apostle of the Gentiles, and regard him as the great champion of the universality of the gospel—and so indeed he was. But if the Gentile movement had been started by those unknown evangelists who preached to the Greeks at Antioch and then carried on and developed by St. Paul—with the Jerusalem Apostles hostile to it because still enchained by their Jewish prejudices—the Church would have been rent in twain from the very start. It was necessary to begin with, therefore, that the Jerusalem Apostles should be converted to the larger vision and the freer faith. It was necessary that they should be emancipated from their narrowing notions and made to realize the largeness of God's purpose and the freeness of Christ's love.

This story of Peter's vision tells us how the emancipating process was begun. The vision was given specially to Peter because he was the recognized leader of the Twelve. It is worth noticing that the vision was given before any preaching to Gentiles on the large scale was begun. That tremendous innovation might have evoked opposition and condemnation in Jerusalem, had not Peter's mind been prepared by this vision for startling developments of that kind.

2. The universality of the gospel, the equal rights of men in the Kingdom of God, are truths surely believed amongst us. What drew our attention to the text was *the reason Peter assigned for refusing to kill and eat*. 'Not so, Lord; for I have never . . .' He refused, not because it was wrong, but because he had never done such a thing in all his life before. This is an illustration of the deadening influence of routine, of the crippling and enslaving power of custom.

Now we would not have been calling your attention to this protest of Peter's if the attitude which it represents were peculiar to himself. But it isn't.

That was a favourite saying of Silvester Horne's: 'The difference between a groove and a grave is only a matter of depth.' And many a man and many an institution have found their graves, so

far as useful service is concerned, simply because they refused to be lifted out of their grooves. They have met every proposal to adopt new methods with Peter's protest, 'Not so, Lord . . . for we have never.'

3. *The Christian Church.*—What God was doing by this vision of the great sheet was this, He was summoning the Church, through Peter its leader, to a bolder and larger policy. The obstacle in the way was the prejudices of the Christians themselves. They had never thought of the Gentiles as fellow-heirs. They had regarded them as outside the pale. When the summons came to offer the gospel to them, they said, 'Not so, Lord; we have never.' And how much it cost to overcome that prejudice, and how long it took, any one may discover who will read the Book of the Acts and the Epistles of St. Paul. Ultimately, after the destruction of Jerusalem, that prejudice was destroyed, and what was a dangerous innovation in the hands of St. Paul became the regular and accepted practice of the Christian Church. But again and again, in the course of the centuries, the Christian Church has displayed exactly the same spirit.

In the eighteenth century the Church in its relation to the heathen world occupied much the same position as the primitive Church did to the Gentile world. It felt under no obligation toward it. It neglected and ignored it. The Christian people of a land like this scarcely looked beyond their own borders. Then it was borne in upon the mind and heart of William Carey that those dim and ignorant millions were also God's children, and that Christ had died to save them. He ventured to speak about all this to a ministers' meeting one day, and this was the reply he got from the president: 'Sit down, young man; when God wishes to convert the heathen He will do it without your aid or mine.'

4. *The Sphere of Doctrine.*—'I believe in the Holy Ghost.' We can all heartily say that, but we do not all accept what that faith involves. For to believe in the Holy Ghost is to believe in growth in our perception of Christian truth, for the Spirit is constantly taking of the things of Christ and revealing them to men. That this is so is abundantly clear to any one who studies the history of the Christian Church. Men have grown in their understanding of Christ's mind. And the growing understanding of Christ's mind has necessitated

changes in the statement of Christian truth. That such changes have taken place in the course of the Christian centuries is undeniable. Doctrines have again and again had to change their form because of the advances of knowledge. The heterodoxies of one day have become the orthodoxies of the next. But there is nothing so distasteful to the average man as to have to change the form of his belief. 'Not so,' we say; 'for we have never.'

Judaism might have had a glorious Resurrection in Christianity had its leaders possessed the open mind. As it was, their house was left unto them desolate.

We need to learn the lesson in those days. For once again the Church finds itself in a time of vast and far-reaching change. New discoveries have necessitated new statements of our faith.

The Church's business in this world is to proclaim a gospel—the great and wonderful gospel of the grace of God in the redemption of mankind through the sacrifice of Christ. It is not here to insist upon a certain cosmogony or a certain theory of inspiration. It is here to proclaim the gospel.¹

FIFTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Cry for Sympathy.

'Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? Behold, and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow.'—La 1¹².

'I remember,' says the Rev. James Rutherford, 'on my first visit to Switzerland years ago, coming upon this text, as you meet it often in the Catholic countries of the Continent. Passing through one of the beautiful Swiss valleys, up the steep path and along the mountain-side, one comes upon a little recess, a covered place by the wayside, with a Crucifix in it, and underneath it this inscription: "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? Behold, and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow." You can fancy how striking it is—there, in the midst of all the glory and the gladness of God's fair earth, is the symbol of shame and suffering and sorrow. To turn from the smiling beauty of Nature to this sorrowful mystery of grace, from the gladness of the living world to this picture of agony and death! As men are passing by, up and down the mountain path, here is the call to turn aside and think and pray. "Jesus our Lord was crucified."'

¹ J. D. Jones, *Christian World Pulpit*, cvi. 283.

1. But the text, as we find it here, does not refer to the sufferings of Christ. Still, there is a kind of inevitable association when we remember Him and His sorrow, so pre-eminent among sorrows, and so despised and forgotten. But there is another reference here, and another lesson before we apply it to Him.

First, it refers to Judah and Jerusalem. This Book of Lamentations is a book of five poems, five dirges, five laments, over the desolation of the Holy City. The first, in the first chapter, gives us a picture of the distress of Jerusalem after its siege by the Assyrians. The city is pictured as a widowed and disrowned princess, a widow bereft of her children, sitting solitary in the night, weeping sorely. She sits, and the night comes, and still she sits. She does not stir. The tears come in the silent solitude of the night, and there is no one to wipe them away. What a picture in contrast with her past! She was not always a lonely widow, but a proud princess, a happy mother. So the poet speaks; and then the deserted city herself takes up the lamentation. It is here that the text comes in, when the dirge is taken up by the desolate daughter of Jerusalem. She begins with this heart-piercing cry to the thoughtless passers-by. This is her complaint against indifference. 'Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?'

2. Is it not true of every sorrow that comes to press sorely on the human heart? This is a very common feeling and a common cry. How painfully we feel the awful indifference of the world! It is a strange feeling we sometimes have when we come out from the darkened room into the light of day—out from the sickroom into the street. See the bright, busy, noisy, laughing world, heedless of the man dying there. How indifferent the great world seemed to your sorrow! How true it is of every heavy trial when we feel the weight of it; and see the world not feeling it at all! 'Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?'

3. But there is another thought here. You may turn the text round against yourself. The cry is not your own but another's. It is not my complaint against the cold world, but the complaint of another against me. For this is what life is like—an endless procession along the great highway; and there are always those who sit apart in sorrow and those who pass heedlessly by. We go past cares and sorrows, disappointments, and bereavements, pain and sickness every hour of the day; and

voices we do not hear are whispering as we go, 'Is it nothing to you?' In ordinary life men mostly know very little of each other and care very little. Every man for himself.

Now surely this text is meant to remind us of this—that the human heart has a great craving for sympathy. And the heartlessness and the heedlessness of the hurrying world becomes at times crushing. If only some would come from the careless crowd and let us feel that we have the compassion of other human hearts, our trouble would not be so hard; and the times come when we almost cry out against it, times when we see the face of One who comes with a word of compassion like the face of an angel.

4. The lesson is not far to seek—that we should do our part to diminish the feeling of neglect, of indifference, to bridge the distance between those who sit by the wayside and those who pass by. Not that we can really make every distress we encounter our own, but we may learn to feel more, to be more ready to comfort, to speak a word in season to him that is weary. What we need is the sympathetic heart.

Think of Christ and mark His ways. He was no lonely hermit, no dweller in the desert. His life led Him along the ways with men. He was found where men were busiest. He was ever 'passing by.' But 'as he passed by,' how keen His eyes were for those who sat by the wayside! Never a longing look cast towards Him remained unanswered; never a sight of suffering met His eyes which did not touch His heart and win His help. His sympathy was perfect.

And what can we ask for ourselves but more of His spirit in us—quick and sensitive and responsive? Opportunity will guide us for the rest, if His spirit is ours; and we shall learn that this is the secret of the happiest life.

5. The words of the text have been taken as prophetic of the sufferings of Christ, but it is not so. They are not Messianic. It is not Jesus but Jerusalem who speaks here. All the same, when we read our text, we remember Him. Our thoughts go to the Cross reared on the hill beyond the city-wall and beside the highway; our thoughts go to the pale figure whose sorrow was as nothing to those who passed by. Inevitably we think of Christ. If ever any one could say it, it was He. Never was there sorrow like His; and though it was the greatest and the grandest and the most fruitful of

blessings to the world, never was there sorrow so despised.

This is the sorrow it most concerns us to remember—the sorrow that saves the world: for what does it mean? It means this. It is the last expression of the sympathy, the compassion of God. He could not pass us by—could not forget us. He looked upon us, loved us, stooped to help us. In His love and pity He redeemed us.

This very chapter ends in an appeal to Heaven. When the passers-by are heedless, the stricken city turns from man to God for pity; and this is the message of the Cross. If your sorrow is nothing to those who pass by, it is something to God, who is afflicted in all our afflictions. That figure of the Crucified is the embodiment of the seeking love of God, of His compassion humbling Himself, identifying Himself with the world's sorrow. It is the last expression of that Divine sympathy which stoops and dies to save and bless.

When we truly know what it means, when we ourselves are saved by such a sympathy, it makes a difference, as we look upon our brothers. It cannot be denied that this story of the Cross has changed the world and the ways of men, as these have been softened and sweetened by thoughtful, tender sympathy. The charity of the Cross makes us charitable, and we love because He first loved.

God sets it before us again and again in Word and Sacrament. The centre of our faith is the Cross—the sorrow that saves the world. It is the sorrow it most concerns us to remember. We would not forget its immense meaning for the remission of sins, but let us not forget that it saves us only as it makes us like Him who loved us and gave Himself for us. Beside that Cross, believing in that Christ, we cannot keep our pride and selfishness or live any longer unto ourselves. 'We must love Him too, and love like Him, and try His works to do.'¹

SUNDAY NEXT BEFORE EASTER.

'The glory of the only Son sent from the Father.'—Jn 1¹⁴.

Glory is one of the great words which cannot be defined. It is not possible to say what it means. Not because it means too little, but because it means too much. It is one of the words that are

used at points where human speech fails, as an attempt to express the inexpressible.

There are many such words in every language, and they have always been great powers in the world. Liberty, Justice, Honour, Equality, Progress, all have this in common, that they defy definition. Libraries have been written to define them, but they remain like mountain peaks refusing to be climbed. The truth is that they all penetrate beneath the reason and the intellect to that underworld of the human mind wherein the primitive, passionate forces of life, the impulses and instincts, exercise their vital power for good or ill. It is for this reason that they are great fighting words. Whenever men are called to battle they are used like drums and trumpets to sound the challenge and stir the blood of men to war. They are the words for which men slay and suffer death. That is why the reckless use of them is mortal sin. They are not words which should be used without a solemn sense of responsibility. The man who plays with them is playing with what Dr. William McDougall calls, 'the central mystery of life and mind and will.'

The glory of Jesus Christ—what is it? What picture was in St. John's mind as he wrote? Was it the picture that he painted elsewhere, 'His head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes were as a flame of fire. And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying, Fear not; I am the first and the last'? Or did his mind swing back to the mount of Transfiguration, to the Jesus whose face did shine as the sun, and whose raiment was white as the light? If we are to judge by the story which follows, the Gospel according to St. John, it is to neither of these points that his mind turns, but to the hill outside the city, and to the central Cross, and the figure hanging serenely patient in His agony upon it. Even more than the others the Fourth Gospel is dominated by, and finds its dénouement in, the Passion. It is at the crowning point of the Passion that he breaks out again into a direct personal testimony. 'He that saw it bare record, and his record is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe.' 'But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water'; 'and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten of the Father—full of grace and truth.' The glory of all the great words finds its only meaning in the

¹ J. Rutherford, *The Seer's House*, 85.

glory of the WORD who became Flesh—the Lamb that was slain from the foundation of the world.

It was the Cross that was the glory centre of the Christ for St. John. It was through the Cross that the gates of the highest heaven were opened wide and he could see within, and in that heaven's very heart he saw the Crucified. That is the central Truth of the Christian Faith, and the hardest Truth to bear.

We cannot believe that God is like Christ, so we make Christ like God to compensate. We are still mostly Greeks or Jews to whom the Cross is either foolishness or a stumbling-block. We are a proud, independent, self-reliant people, and have never been happy with Christ crucified as revealing the glory of God. To us it would degrade God and demean His dignity to suppose that He was harmless, and could not hurt any one physically. What we think is, 'Christ was meek and gentle once, just to give us a chance, but now He is gone up on high, and when He comes again it will be altogether different. He will come in glory, and of course that means with a sword and a host of heavily armoured angels, and torments for the wicked in His hands.' So we interpret the passages that tell us of His coming in power and great glory, as though His power and His glory could change their nature, and from being the power of Love become the power of force and fear, and from being the glory of service and humility become the glory of domination and pride. Christ was Jesus once on earth, but when He comes again He will be like 'God, a super-super-Napoleon. Thus we do not see the glory of Christ, but give Him a glory of our own.

We do this inevitably until we really see Him. Then we realize that it is not Christ that changes His glory, but we that must change ours.

There are many modern thinkers who call upon us loudly to take the way of the world, and take it with vigour; to close our ranks against the common foe, which is the coloured races and the submerged masses of the world; to reassert our natural supremacy, brush aside all scruples, and boldly adopt a thoroughgoing policy of world-wide domination and repression.

It is evident even to these men that the sands of time are running out, and that we must decide. What shall we do with the man Christ Jesus? Put Him to death as a silly-dreaming fool, who betrays and cannot save the world? or hail Him King of

kings, and Lord of lords, the only Ruler of peoples? We must do one or the other, unless we are to drift to our destruction.

'Something has come over us all. We are not the men we were. But we will recover,' the strong men say. 'It is only a passing phase. The good old times will come back again. It is only shell-shock. This milk-and-water sentiment will die out, and we shall recover our nerves, take up the white man's burden, and go out to rule and punish.' I wonder! I wonder! I am frightened of Christ. I think those who rage and spit on Him, who declare defiantly that He is dead and done for, those who caricature and curse Him, as the terrified rulers of Russia and the strong men here at home do, scorning the Sermon on the Mount as an impossible dream—I think their fear of Him, which is manifest in their defiance, is nearer the Truth than the indifference of those who think He does not matter.

But this Jesus unmans us. Just when we are going to assert our proper rights, and claim our own position, He comes and looks at us, and asks us awkward questions as to whether our rights are right, and whether we have any position. He is dangerous. He takes the fight out of a man.

He is going to drive us to a decision with His wounded hands. He will not let us have His world for a playground, a battlefield, a factory, or an empire any longer; we must give it to Him.

That is the meaning of this Lent. As He looks down upon you—with anxious wonder in His eyes—He sees the world in you. He thinks the world of every one of us. Are you going to try and keep the world for a playground in which you have a good time, a battlefield on which you strive for your own personal ambitions, a factory to make wealth for you to spend, an empire to satisfy your pride? or are you going to give it up to Him? Half-measures are no good. Compromise without repentance and consecration will not save you or the world. It is the surest way to destruction. If all your Christ can do for you is to turn you into a caged beast, a respectable sinner, a half-hearted servant of the old red lusts, you cannot save your soul alive, or save the world in which you live. It is a personal matter—yet not a purely personal matter. You live in a world, and a world yet lives in you. For God's sake do not think you do not matter; you are all that matters, for you are in all, and all is in you. Make

up your mind. Do you believe in the glory of Christ—as of the only Son sent from the Father's side?

Do you believe that in reality this world is not a battlefield for opposing armies, but a home for a family? Are you prepared to risk your life and your children's lives, and to stake the honour of your country on that faith? Will you risk Good Friday to win an Easter Day?

Lord, I believe, help Thou mine unbelief. I look upon the world and I see a Baby on a Mother's Breast, a Body broken on a Cross, an Empty Tomb with a great stone rolled away, and One like unto the Son of Man with wounded hands outstretched to bless, ascending in His Glory; and I believe that, right at the heart of the ultimate reality there was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end, a Person expressing a rational purpose which men can in some

measure understand. I believe that this Person, was, is, and ever shall be with God, and indeed is God, though it is nearer the Truth to say 'with God,' for 'the Father is greater than he.' I believe that through this Person all things came into being, and that, apart from Him, not a single thing came into being which is of the nature of reality. In Him are the eternal sources of life—that life which from the darkness of mere sensation becomes light of intelligence in men, a light shining in darkness which cannot overcome it. I believe that this Person took upon Himself, and expressed Himself through, our human nature, and lived out a human life among men, and that they beheld, and can now behold, His glory, which is the glory of the only perfect expression of Love, which is the ultimate and absolute reality of all things.¹

¹ G. A. Studdert Kennedy, *The Lord and the Work*, 74.

The Religious Development of the Child.

BY THE REVEREND T. GRIGG-SMITH, M.A., DIRECTOR OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE DIOCESE OF MANCHESTER.

No attempt at religious education can be considered worthy of the present day which does not take account of all the departments of knowledge which modern child study is placing at its disposal, and it would be faithless to think that anything but good can come of a reverent and scientific study of the religious development of the child. In a short article only a few main principles and one or two points of interest can be mentioned. Much further reverent research is greatly to be desired, for anything like a comprehensive treatment of the subject has still to be written.

A word of explanation of the use of the term 'mind' in this article must be given at the outset. It is taken as including all those activities and powers of the human being not usually assigned to the body; that is, as comprising all that in the older trichotomy was attributed to 'the intellect and the soul' or 'the mind and the spirit,' for, to regard the human being as a *body-mind*, with emphasis on his unity, seems a much truer and therefore more profitable way of thinking than to endeavour to divide him into body, mind, and

spirit. This use of the term 'mind' also carries with it a better employment of the term 'religious,' which becomes inclusive of the whole range of life, declining to admit such a division as 'secular and religious.' The entire mind and every part of life thus become naturally included in religion. This, at least, is the goal of which most Christians would approve. 'He therefore is the devout man . . . who makes all the parts of his common life parts of piety, by doing everything in the Name of God, and under such rules as are conformable to His glory.'² In other words, Christ is sufficient to embrace the whole range of human life, sin only excepted, and just as the smallest acts of existence may be sacramental, with the Sacraments of the Gospel crowning them all, so the most insignificant experiences may minister to the child's religious growth. Is not one of the earliest sacraments of the child the look from his mother's eyes, speaking love, tenderness, protection, confidence, strength? It is one of those things wherein, even among the heathen, God has left

² Law, *Serious Call*, chap. i.

not Himself without witness. The ideal religious development of the individual would be, then, that of the complete body-mind at its highest and best; such as, in fact, we believe to have been experienced by Jesus, who, as a child, 'increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man.'

After this very necessary endeavour to gain the right outlook, let us proceed in more particular with our subject.

Since all people either develop or retain the capacity for religion, it is entirely in accord with reason to consider that the religious potentialities of the child are as much an integral part of his capacities and tendencies as any portion of the inherited stock with which he enters the world. Further, just as certain bodily organs, such as the heart, act spontaneously, so there are spontaneous mental activities, and among them integral religious elements. Heredity should have as much to say on this as on any cognate subject, and just as there are *born* musicians and poets, so we ought to expect there should be, and do actually find, children who are born with greater capacity for religious development than others. We speak of a child's religious temperament, and can compare and contrast one with another. But, 'What are popularly described as differences of temperament appear to be in part differences in the relative strength of groups of tendencies, and in part in the relative prominence of groups of capacities. There appear to be, in fact, correlated groups of capacities and of tendencies, variation in which forms the basis of recognized differences of temperament.' But there are undoubtedly other differences, which have most probably a purely physiological basis. One individual may react with movement, thought, or feeling more rapidly than another, independently of any difference in tendency or capacity, unless we regard such rapidity of reaction as representing a special capacity. Or again, emotional disturbances, as expressed in what we call the "organic resonance" of emotion, may be more pronounced in one individual than in another, also independently of any difference of tendency or capacity, unless we recognize a capacity for emotional control. In any case, these are general and pervasive differences of the sort we usually denominate temperamental.¹ Hence it must be remembered that

the first signs we see are simply the first *observed* signs of religious consciousness. In other words, as in the case of the manifest exercise of sympathy, intelligence, or other mental activities, so also in the case of that 'tone' or 'feeling' (by no means to be confused with superficial emotionalism) which comprehends them all, and which we call 'religion,' there lies behind what we observe a whole history of processes paralleled by those others endured as the human being develops from the nucleated cell. The child's first real prayer has been preceded by a whole series of exercises in varying degrees of sympathy, attention, memory, and imitation, but by no means of mere mechanical imitation severed from religious experience, however rudimentary.

For the average parent, teacher, or other adult having contact with children, interest in religious development chiefly centres in the observed responses from the child to external appeals. It is well, however, not to lose sight of the origins of these responses, and the more their source can be traced and their true nature understood, so much the more intelligent and hopeful of permanence will become religious education. It may prove most helpful if we now proceed to consider separately those recognized periods of the child's growth usually termed Infancy (to the age of about 5 years); Childhood (from about 5 to 8 years); Late Childhood (from about 8 to 11 years); and Adolescence (from about 11 to 17 or 20 years, including Pre-adolescence for two years from the age of 11 in girls and 12 in boys). These stages, of course, merge one into another and no clear, hard-and-fast division is possible.

I. Infancy.—The general statement that from birth to the age of about 4½ years the child is living in the world of the senses appears in the main to be true. Mental processes are ministered to by sight, hearing, touch (all three close together in importance), taste, and smell, and the child is very much at one with the things that surround him. Investigation in its present state shows that Imitation is the most powerful aid to the extension of mental experience and progress during this time. Imitation is 'the general tendency shown by an individual to take over from others their modes of action, thought, and feeling. It ranges widely through the animal kingdom, and its effects are so subtly interwoven with those of specific heredity that the two are hard to disentangle. . . .

¹ J. Drever, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Education*, p. 45.

And it seems that even among lower animals the rôle of imitation has been underestimated. Young chicks and pheasants are often first set pecking and drinking by the example of their seniors or more adventurous companions, and jungle pheasants and young ostriches are said to perish of hunger in the absence of this natural stimulus to pecking, or of such a colourable copy of it as an experimenter can give by tapping with a pencil. As the foregoing examples indicate, imitation appears at all levels of conscious activity. The behaviour of the chick in learning to peck or drink illustrates what Professor Lloyd Morgan calls "biological" or "instinctive" imitation. This is the lowest level. At the highest level we have "reflective" or deliberate imitation, of which the regeneration of Japan offers, perhaps, the most grandiose example in history. In human behaviour the two types pass one into another by insensible gradations.¹ . . . And again, 'Imitation, at first biological, then reflective, is, in fact, but the first stage in the creation of individuality, and the richer the scope for imitation the richer the developed individuality will be.'²

From this it will readily be seen that environment plays a vital part in the religious development of the individual during infancy, and in 'environment' must be included all that ministers to the child's existence physically and mentally: food, clothing, hygiene, opportunities for exercise and play, and all that contributes to the mind through the senses. If these are religious in the sense of the term indicated above, they will all contribute to the child's religious development. 'The best way for a child to acquire the fear of God,' wrote Pestalozzi, 'is for him to see and hear a true Christian,' and this because the true Christian will help him to discover God in all things even as he himself has first discovered Him—in nature, in the home and all human relationships, and in personality, especially in the personality of Jesus. The whole process will, it must be hoped, take a normal, healthy, and natural course. It is something akin to blindness to regard religious education as the acquisition by the child of older people's conventions; for this may not only defeat its own purpose but prove to be of lasting harm. The following is one of many illustrations that have come under

the present writer's notice of the feeling of resentment that may be aroused by the imposition of undue pressure upon the child's acquisition of religious accomplishments by a well-intentioned, but nevertheless mistaken adult. A boy of the age of 4 years and 3 months was admitted to one of our elementary schools, and when he had attended for a fortnight it so happened that his teacher, for special reasons of her own, wished the children to be able to sing two hymns. The whole of the religious instruction period that morning was spent in learning them, and as one was but slowly acquired it was practised again at noon. In the evening the little boy's mother, who had found out from other sources that he had learnt the hymns, asked him to sing something. He replied that he did not know anything. 'Yes, you do,' she said, 'you have learnt a hymn about Jesus; sing that.' 'No,' answered the boy, 'I am sick of God.' So outspoken a declaration is not often heard; but we cannot be justified in incurring the danger that even such *thoughts* should be aroused by our demands upon the young mind. Far wiser are we in encouraging normal interest and self-activity in religious directions.

With imitation go Sympathy and Suggestion, both of which are important factors in development. A psychologist who has observed the behaviour of his own children, makes the statement below, which may be profitably analysed and pondered. The reader may be able to recall similar observations of his own. A very interesting feature in this example is the early age at which sympathy and suggestion are operative. 'When S. was 57 days old and I was sitting by her cradle I scolded R. (her older sister), and said in a loud voice, "For shame, R." On the instant S. began to cry, without any other discernible cause than the sound of my voice; and when I spoke soothingly to her she very quickly became silent.'³ When children enter our schools they may at first choose to walk about during prayers, receiving through eyes and ears impressions of what is going on. This should by no means be checked, for it is in all probability a prelude to that sympathy which is the most valuable factor in the child's devotional life. 'In so far as imitation affects feeling it leads to "fellow-feeling" or sympathy in the strict meaning of the word. Here it does its most important work, for feeling is the prime mover of

¹ T. Percy Nunn, *Education: Its Data and First Principles*, p. 119.

² *Op. cit.* p. 124.

³ Rasmussen, *Child Psychology*, p. 39.

thought and action.'¹ The child soon wishes to imitate its schoolfellows, with their hands together and eyes closed and saying their words. Suggestion in its strict sense is defined by McDougall as 'a process of communication resulting in the acceptance with conviction of the communicated proposition in the absence of logically adequate grounds for its acceptance.'² Many children will not only place their hands together and close their eyes, but even think and feel at our suggestion; but the child's suggestibility varies with circumstances, physical and mental, and we must be prepared to allow for such variations. The disposition and furnishing of the room, the choice and arrangement of flowers and pictures, together with the movements, looks, and tone of voice of the teacher, as well as a discreet use of wisely chosen music, may all help by suggestion and the arousing of sympathy to develop the right religious feeling, thought, and action. Since the child is living in the world of the senses during this period, any attempt at a story to convey religious truth should be accompanied by a liberal use of objects and pictures, and time should be allowed for their detailed examination. An interesting experiment which carries conviction in this matter is first to tell, let us say, the story of the Good Samaritan, without any help other than that of the spoken word, and then to tell it to the same or to another group of children of this age, but this time accompanying the narration with the building up, detail by detail, of a model as the story proceeds.

II. *Childhood*.—With the general increase of physical and mental control and activity, and as the child's world grows larger, there appears that most important new factor—an often riotous and usually self-regarding Imagination. This seems undoubtedly the most potent influence in development from 5 to 8 years of age. By its means the child can be almost anybody and do almost anything. He can climb, fly, or travel anywhere on this earth, under the sea, or beyond, and do anything he has seen his elders do, or that he thinks he himself would do if given the freedom and licence which they appear to have. He can create for himself avenues of expression and even companions which may in actual life be denied him. 'When R. was 6 years 6 months old, she one day

began dancing and kicking her legs about . . . at an imaginary ball, and was seeking an imaginary fiancé (the housemaid had recently become engaged). R. danced to an invisible gentleman and sang, "Will you be engaged to me?" The gentleman was made to answer, "But I am married." R. said, "Oh, then you're no good; I must find some one else." She then asked another imaginary person, who said, "Yes, with pleasure." R. danced round the room with him. Suddenly she sang, "Now he's dead," threw herself down on the floor, and bowed her head in despair. Then she stood up and began to sing a mournful song, stretching out her hand theatrically: "I see his coffin." But soon afterwards she sang, "Now I must go and find another," and began the wild dance over again.'³

It is this same imagination, used upon different subjects, but in an equally powerful manner, that is the greatest aid to religious development during this period. It will 'piece out the imperfections' of our Bible and other stories, and will aid creative self-expression, whether the medium be speech, drawing, modelling, or writing. At the same time, as is natural in a being conscious of dependence and weakness, the use of the imagination is self-centred. Hence it is obvious that to win the imagination to aid the exercise of thought, feeling, and action for and on behalf of others is an important part of religious training.

Two questions are outstanding among the many that arise in any consideration of the very important period from birth to the age of 8 or 9 years. (a) How does the child think of God? (b) How does he think of Jesus?

(a) Whatever older folk may think desirable, the plain fact is that all children think of God in terms of a man. Almost every day I see models and drawings of God made by children of about 6 years and under; and a number of such drawings are before me as I write. If the reader is shocked at this, let him pray that his eyes may be opened; for these drawings are full of reverence and beauty, and it is certain that the worship they express is accepted before the throne of God. If any one asserts that he did not as a child first think of God as a man, very great and wonderful no doubt, then he must have forgotten his own childhood. There is only space for a description of two drawings. The first was in answer to the appeal, 'Draw

¹ T. Percy Nunn, *Education: Its Data and First Principles*, p. 124.

² W. McDougall, *Social Psychology*, p. 97.

³ Rasmussen, *Child Psychology*, p. 79.

anything which shows that God loves us.' The little artist of 6 years 2 months has scattered over his paper no less than sixteen figures, which he explained as he pointed to them: the sun, potatoes, a banana, a 'chucky' hen, an apple tree, a house, a boy playing with his engine, a girl with a piece of bread and butter in her hand, an egg, and a man gathering grapes from a tree. In the top right-hand corner, level with the sun, is a figure in human form. The boy explained, 'That is God. He is in Heaven. He gives us all these things.' The second drawing is one of a number by a group of children who previously had not been allowed to draw in connexion with their religious instruction. They, too, were asked by the teacher to draw anything which shows that God loves us. After filling in the blue sky, and placing in it the sun, this girl of 6½ years drew a human figure not far from the sun, and after marking two straight lines across her paper, wrote, 'God is a good man, and He loves little children.' She explained, 'God lives in Heaven, and Jesus does.'

Those who are interested in racial recapitulation will see the parallel stage to this in the account of the Creation in Gn 2, where God comes to the earth and forms man of the dust, He plants a garden, walks there in the cool of the evening, and even makes clothes. But such thoughts of God in terms of man are common throughout the Old Testament, and are inherent in any primitive state of religious thought, whether in the race or the individual. To complain that such ideas are wicked or false is as futile as to complain that a bird is born with pin-feathers. Our chief care should be that no attributes contrary to His nature are in these human terms assigned to God. We shall therefore select even our Bible material with the greatest possible care. God will be shown to the child as loving, merciful, good, kind, tender, wonderful, holy, strong to protect, to sympathize, to help. He will be found as He is in the man Jesus. But for thoughts of God to remain in human terms is clearly a case of arrested religious development. As the individual's actual, concrete world increases, so human limitations, however extended, are understood to be inadequate for God, and we should do all in our power to help our children to think of God in terms of spirit. But it is unwise to seek to hasten this process unduly. If our preliminary work is right and true, the later development will take its natural course.

(b) So long as the child is living in the world of the senses, Jesus is thought of as an ordinary man, but very wonderful. He is distinguished from God. Among the second group of drawings already referred to was one by a girl of 6 years 5 months, consisting of two human figures, under one of which was written the word 'God,' and under the other 'Jesus.' When asked, without any suggestion, to tell about them, it was explained, 'God is very nice. He is a nice man.' Then followed these questions and answers. 'Who is nicer, God or Jesus?' 'God.' 'Much nicer?' 'A bit.' 'Do you know a man nicer than the Lord Jesus?' 'God is nicer.' 'Is there any man in this town nicer than Jesus?' 'No.' Curiously it happened that in this case the teacher had told the children some days before that 'Jesus is God,' and all had written the words on their boards at her request; but, in spite of this, the child was thinking her own thoughts.

The following evidence of how, with the use of a most carefully selected lesson material, children think of Jesus, was taken from a single school, specially chosen for such an inquiry because of its spiritual and educational fitness.¹ It was at the same time ascertained with great care and in each individual case, that neither in day nor Sunday school, nor at home had the children been taught to speak of Jesus as God, or to say any such formula as 'Jesus is God.'

The youngest group consisted of seventeen children, all under the age of 5 years, and a talk had been given on the Healing of the Nobleman's Son. Afterwards, they modelled in clay any part of the story they chose, and a co-operative central model was built up by them all. A boy of 4 years 10 months had modelled the nobleman's little son.

Q. 'Who made the little boy better?'

A. 'The Lord Jesus.' (Boy sitting next, interpolating: 'God made him better. He made me better when I was in the hospital.')

Q. (to former boy). 'Do you think God made the little boy better?'

A. 'Yes.'

Q. 'Is Jesus God?'

A. (emphatically) 'No.'

¹ The selection of teaching material made in accordance with the principles expressed in this article and in use in the school here referred to will be found in *A Suggested Syllabus of Religious Instruction*, published by Macmillan.

So far as could be ascertained no child in this group thought of Jesus as God. He was to them a wonderful man, while God was, as it were, a wonderful Divine man.

In the highest group of this school were thirty-three children of the average age of $6\frac{1}{2}$ years. Each child was catechized individually and apart from the rest, and no communication was made from one to another after the questioning. No notice of the investigation was given. The room was that in which morning prayers had been offered, and the main sequence and the form of the questions were identical for each child.

Q. 'You remember we all stood round here this morning and said our prayers and sang our hymns? Who was listening to them?'

A. 'The Lord Jesus,' or 'God.' One boy said, 'God,' and then, as though half-correcting himself, added, 'And the Lord Jesus.'

If the answer was, 'The Lord Jesus,' the child was asked, 'Do you remember we sang

Giver of the gentle rain,

We bring our thanks to Thee?

Who sends the rain?'

A. 'God.'

Q. 'Is the Lord Jesus God?' (N.B.—So far as could be discovered these children had never been asked this question before.)

A. 'Yes.' Some added, 'He helps to send the rain.'

If the answer was 'God,' the question was asked, 'Do you remember the prayer we said, "Dear Lord Jesus, come and stand among us as we gather in school"? Who listened to that?'

A. 'The Lord Jesus.'

Q. 'Is the Lord Jesus God?'

A. 'Yes.'

On about six occasions the last question was varied to, 'Is the Lord Jesus the same as God?' The answer was still 'Yes.' In only four cases out of the thirty-three did children show that they did not think of Jesus fully in terms of God. These said that God, and not the Lord Jesus, sent the rain; and when asked where the Lord Jesus is now, they said, 'In Heaven,' and in reply to the question, 'Who else lives there?' they said, 'God.'

It was clear that the twenty-nine children thought of the attributes of God as being possessed equally by Jesus. That this should have been so is a source of great encouragement to those who desire above

all things to lead the children into His presence, to help them to behold Him, and then to stand aside and allow Him to do His work. Time and wider experience yield increasing vindication of such principles, applied in full accord with the mental stage of development of the child; and the influence of their application upon spiritual understanding and healthy faith inspire those so labouring to renewed zeal and humble service in the great cause. Encouragement, too, is to be found in the fact that this was Christ's own method: to His disciples He allowed 'What manner of man is this?' to precede 'Thou art the Christ' and 'My Lord and my God.'

III. *Late Childhood*.¹—During this period the imagination becomes more stable, the child sorts and arranges his knowledge, takes a longer view of history, becomes a worshipper of heroes, and finds great attraction in being either a leader or a follower in a team. All these elements we shall be wise to use in aiding his religious development. At the age of about $10\frac{1}{2}$ or 11 years the mind gains a historical perspective clearer in comparison with what has preceded any other period during the whole of life. Here, then, with the straightening out of history, help to a clearer understanding of the revelation of God mediated through history may be attempted. Ideas of God may with permanent benefit be examined and where necessary corrected. Characters and scenes of the Bible may be placed in their historical setting, compared and contrasted with other kindred matters even to the present day. The nature of its books and their origin may be dealt with. The Church may be more truly understood as 'the body of Christ.'

IV. *Adolescence*.—Following the period of remarkable stability at which we have just glanced comes for two years that mental upheaval which later is accompanied by the physical change we call adolescence. The imagination again becomes more riotous, its nature contrasting with that of infancy in that it is social and has a note of yearning. The adolescent longs to be and to do for the sake of others. He craves for companionship with those of his own generation and for leadership and guidance from his elders. He asks for help in

¹ No more than a meagre summary can be attempted for this and the remaining period. It has appeared wiser to use the available space in the treatment of the subject already given, though at the risk of necessary curtailment here.

the solution of the problems of that wider life opening out to him, and at least privately he questions and criticizes everything. Now is the time for the formation of ideals of permanent value, and anything of the nature of conversion is more valid and lasting than any similar experience at a previous time. These and other factors make the period of adolescence in some ways the most important of all in the religious development of the individual.

Although their implications and importance are vitally great, as will readily be seen, it is not possible here to do more than mention that throughout the whole range of life we have been considering will run, if religious development is to be of its highest and best, the threefold strand of active and living faith, worship, and work. The growth and comprehensiveness of these involve both the nature and the effectiveness of the human being's mental, and frequently also his physical, life.

Recent Foreign Theology.

'On God.'

IN certain ways Rade's short volume 'On God'¹ is in a class by itself among German works on dogmatic. It is warm and vivacious in style, informal and conversational, exclamatory at times and by no means averse to an anecdote, at once scientific and edifying. One puts it down with a keen liking for the author. It ought to be a favourite with preachers. Few books on dogmatic as taught in Continental classrooms are written for those who know neither Latin nor Greek, but here quotations from both languages, invariably are translated. Deeply evangelical in tone, it takes Luther next to the Bible as its source of inspiration; and his marrowy sentences are on every page, alongside of more sedate *dicta* from theologians of the great Lutheran era, verses from rolling hymns, and opinions from the freshest authorities of the day. If the lectures out of which the book has grown were in the least like the book itself, they must have been fascinating. Rade speaks throughout with his eye on present-day conditions in his own country, but he has a wider horizon. 'I wanted,' he says, 'to make a book from which Catholics, Jews and heathen could see what we Evangelicals to-day believe.' He has succeeded; and there can be little doubt that when the work is completed by the further issue of volumes entitled 'On Christ' and 'On the Holy Spirit,' the whole will take a distinctive place.

We may single out these points. Two interesting

pages near the start bring out the fact that in recent negotiations about 'disestablishment' in Prussia, the State has taken a less rigidly legal view of creed-subscription than the Church—precisely as in Scotland at the close of the seventeenth century. Although tolerably Ritschlian in sympathy, Rade holds that Schleiermacher's account of what religion is, namely, 'the feeling of utter dependence,' is the best definition yet given. He lays uncommon stress on the point that the Christian in having God as Saviour has his neighbour too; the right formula is not 'God and my soul,' but 'God, my neighbour's soul, and my soul.' This makes the Church a vital part of salvation, not an accident. And it means, too, that we cannot envisage God apart from the world, or think of reconciliation with God except as including peace with men. Rade treats of God's saving work before discussing His essence or being, so anxious is he to keep close to experience. He raises the question whether it is really in keeping with what the New Testament has to say about God as love to represent the end and aim of all He does as 'His own glory,' which either means that 'glory' has assumed a new meaning, better expressed by some other term, or that it still means something very like 'prestige,' which is sub-Christian. And he rightly urges that the end of all is the Kingdom of God; it is this that the Father wills and works for always. His reading of the many-sided phrase 'Kingdom of God' may be described as a Christianized modification of Kant's teaching.

All the old problems are here (they can never be shirked), but they are as modern as broadcasting. The attributes of God, the theistic proofs, the

¹ *Glaubenslehre*, Erster Band, *Gott*, by Martin Rade, Professor in Marburg (F. A. Perthes, Stuttgart, 1924; pp. xii, 182; 3.50 goldmark).

enigma of evil (moral and physical), the absoluteness and the personality of God—Rade faces them all and lets us see how every one of them bears on the redemption of God's family. There is a specially good paragraph on Election, which unconsciously suggests that in this matter Calvinists and Lutherans had pretty fairly divided the truth between them. We speak of God's mercy *and* judgment, but Rade brings out with great power the fact that God's judgment of our sin is the first chapter of a merciful process of redemption. It is really as Protector that the Father punishes the children He would save. An unexpected merit in the book is its inclusion of a good section on Sanctification, which too many Lutherans for some mysterious reason have relegated to Christian Ethics, as if it were not God who sanctified as well as reconciled. After this central discussion of God's saving work come paragraphs on Creation and Divine Government; and here Rade puts in a cogent plea for the idea of 'eternal creation.' A noticeably full treatment of the Trinity ends the whole. We *must* have a doctrine of the Trinity, Rade holds, if we are not to be polytheists; but it must be a teleological one, and speculations on eternal distinctions within the Godhead are better left to the philosophic imagination. Our redemption comes from the Father in the Son, through the Spirit.

Here and there justifiable criticisms of recent authors are interpolated, as of Otto and Brunner. But Rade is no polemic. He is an exceptionally keen and warm-hearted Christian thinker. His next volume is sure of its audience.

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

Edinburgh.

Old Testament Commentaries and other Aids to Study.

PROFESSOR JOÜON, who is a philological expert and has written an exhaustive Hebrew Grammar, offers, in his Commentary on Ruth,¹ what he calls 'a modest contribution to the knowledge of Hebrew and the criticism of the Massoretic text.' Such knowledge, he reminds us, is fundamental to all

sound exegesis and emendation. 'Many emendations of the text suggested by considerations of higher criticism—to say nothing of metre, this new calamity of textual criticism—are condemned by the language.' A commentary written from this angle is naturally stronger on its philological than on its strictly exegetical side. To the adequate treatment of such a book as Ruth the poetic temperament and imaginative sympathy are no less necessary than scholarship. Such a treatment it has received from Gunkel in the fifth chapter of his *Reden und Aufsätze*: Joüon has chosen to tread the narrower path of the scholar. He is well equipped for his task; he frequently quotes the Arabic Versions, and he is not afraid to break a lance with the German and English lexicographers.

In his introduction he discusses the aim and historicity of the book. While not denying that it may have secondary aims, such as the inculcation of the duty of piety towards the members of one's family, the exhibition of the kindly Providence that governs human life, and possibly of the importance of levirate marriage whether interpreted in the strict or in a more liberal sense, the chief aim of the book, he contends, is to preserve an edifying story relative to the origins of the great King David. But he keenly challenges the view which has recently been popular, and which was first suggested over one hundred years ago, that the book is a polemic against the exclusive marriage legislation of the times of Ezra and Nehemiah, to whom the marriage of a Jew with a foreign woman was anathema. In the phrase *the Moabitess*, which is often applied to Ruth, he detects no polemic note except conceivably in 2², and even there not necessarily. He argues that the hypothesis of 'tendency' in the book presupposes that it is later than the marriage legislation of Ezra-Nehemiah—which is not proved; further, that this 'tendency,' had it been present, would probably have kept it out of the Palestinian canon; and again, that we should have expected it to crop up in the scene between Boaz and the kinsman—the latter expressing his unwillingness to marry Ruth because she was a foreigner.

The obscurity of the names Mahlon, Chilion, and Orpah, which might be interpreted allegorically, has been exploited to throw suspicion on the historicity of the book. This, argues Joüon, is not fair. The other names, Naomi, Ruth, and Boaz, are certainly historical, and there is no serious difficulty in believing that the names of the secondary

¹ *Ruth, Commentaire philologique et exégétique*, par le P. Paul Joüon, S.J., Professeur à l'Institut Biblique (Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, Piazza della Pilotta, 35).

personages may have been preserved. The author, who did not take the liberty of inventing a name for the kinsman, is not likely to have invented the name of Orpah, who plays a less important part in the story.

The linguistic facts of the book point to a time after the age of Jeremiah, and its spirit and contents place it after the Exile, more probably near the beginning of the post-exilic period than later. In an interesting Note, the Editor challenges this opinion of Joüon's, and argues for a pre-exilic date, with which he thinks the serene and happy tone of the story is more congruous than with the difficult and troubled period that followed the return; nor, he contends, can the Aramaisms be fairly exploited in favour of the later date.

The Notes abound in delicate appreciation of grammatical subtleties and in careful discussions of the text and suggestions for its emendation. A few of these may be singled out. For the difficult clause at the end of 2⁷ rendered by R.V., 'save that she tarried a little in the house,' he suggests *לֹא שָׁבְתָה שְׁכָתָה מְעַט* ('she did not give herself (even) a little rest.' For 2¹⁶ *שֶׁל־תִּשְׁלֹ*, which presupposes a very unusual, if not impossible, meaning for *שֶׁל*, he proposes *שִׁבְלִים תִּשְׁלֹ*, 'ye shall let the ears fall' (from *נָשַׁל*). In 2¹⁹ *אָנָּה עָשִׂיתָ* rendered 'where hast thou wrought?' (but *אָנָּה* never means *where*? always *whither*? and this question would just be an idle repetition of the preceding one) he suggests *וְאִתִּי עָשִׂיתָ*, 'and with whom hast thou had to do?' In 3¹⁴ he reads *וַיָּקָם* ('and he arose') rather than *וַתִּקָּם* ('and she arose'); it is for Boaz to take the initiative and to guard alike his own reputation and Ruth's. In 3¹⁵ he prefers, with many MSS, *וַתָּבֹא*, 'and she went into the city,' to *וַיָּבֹא*, 'he entered'; it is only later, in 4¹, that Boaz goes to the city—he cannot leave the threshing-floor till some one arrives to watch it. In 4³ he has an excellent grammatical note on the pf. *מְכַרָּהּ* to express the present of instantaneous action—'she is putting up . . . for sale'; the word is not to be emended to the ptc. *מְכַרָּהּ* or *מְכַרָּהּ*, for which, besides, the more usual form would be *מְכַרָּהּ*. In 4⁷ the curious pf. *שָׁלַף*, followed by *waw* consec. with the pf. *וַיִּנָּח* (which is very appropriate in describing a custom), he alters to the much more probable frequentative impf. *יִשְׁלַף* and points out that the ' has textual support in the Greek *καί* (=). Finally he suggests that for *קָרָא שֵׁם* in 4¹¹, which can hardly mean 'be famous,' we ought to

read *קָנָה שֵׁם* (or *קָנָה*) 'acquire renown'; *קָנָה שֵׁם*, he thinks, was used in place of the usual phrase *עָשָׂה שֵׁם* in order to avoid the repetition of *עָשָׂה* which had appeared immediately before in the phrase *עָשָׂה חֵיל*, 'do worthily.' These illustrations are sufficient to justify Professor Joüon in his hope that he has in his Commentary made 'a modest contribution to the criticism of the Massoretic text.'

Sellin has contributed to the great Old Testament Commentary which he is so ably editing the volume on the Minor Prophets.¹ On this area the problems—textual, metrical, historical, and exegetical—are legion. Sellin has attacked them all with his wonted ingenuity and independence; and, in accordance with one of the ideas which he proposed should govern this whole series, he has done remarkable justice, too rarely to be met with in commentaries, to the religious element in these perplexing books, or rather in the prophetic personalities reflected in these books. No task of Old Testament science is more important than to recover its great personalities, and, most of all, the prophets. In this task Sellin has been singularly successful. In his commentary we are made to feel, as we are seldom made to feel in commentaries, that we are dealing with religious literature. It is further full of clever and interesting textual conjectures, and of fresh exegetical suggestions. Hosea, e.g., is regarded as originally belonging to the ranks of the ecstatic prophets, and his call came in the form of a command to marry a harlot—an act which is the more conceivable in view of his 'ecstatic' quality. The happy outlook of many passages in this and other prophets is original and not due to later interpolation. Nahum is not, as many maintain, a 'false' nationalistic prophet, but he, like Jeremiah, stands in the service of the world-God. Habakkuk, including chap. 3, is a unity, coming from the beginning of the Greek period. The famous passage Mal 1¹¹ refers neither to the diaspora nor to proselytes, but to the contemporary heathen and their worship of the 'Most High God.' The elusive reference to the 'law' in Hos 8¹², by reading *דְּבָרִי* for *רְבוּ*, he explains as the words of Jahweh's law proclaimed by Hosea himself: this, if correct, would be a simple solution of an ancient controversy. He admits his

¹ *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch*, übersetzt und erklärt von D. Ernst Sellin (Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung: geh. Mk. 12.60; geb. Mk. 15).

debt to Klostermann's notes, one sample of which is the brilliant emendation of Am 8⁴, which for לְשֹׁבֵית gives לְבָקֵר (suggested by LXX), and after אֲשֶׁם adds לְבָקֵר (from LXX εἰς τὸ πρῶτ = לְבָקֵר): the verse then reads 'ye who long for the oxen of the poor and the lambs of the needy.' There are few pages without similar striking comments on text or exegesis.

A remarkably sympathetic study of Jeremiah, full of delicate psychological insight, has been written by H. W. Hertzberg. The book¹ is an attempt to understand the personality of Jeremiah on its religious side, and to show how he differs from and advances upon his great predecessors Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah. The contrast is very strikingly worked out. Hertzberg argues that the earlier prophets were, in a sense, passive—the organs and instruments of God: powerful personalities in relation to their fellows, but passive in their relation to the Divine word, which they obediently proclaimed as it came to them. Jeremiah, on the other hand, is not merely an organ, he is a relatively independent personality, reflecting, challenging, clearly distinguishing between his own thoughts and God's revelation, and more than once attesting his exquisite integrity of soul by waiting until he was sure beyond peradventure of the Divine word. The earlier prophets had summoned men to *do* good, Jeremiah to *be* good—here, as in many another direction, deepening the religion of Israel. The broadly human in him emerges as the more distinctly prophetic recedes: it is no accident that he shows so fine an appreciation of the religious capacity of the heathen. His certainty of God rests on his intensely personal experience of Him; and though he never ceases to be a loyal son of Israel, he confronts God rather as man than as Israelite, and thus travels far on the way to universalism. Reflective as well as emotional, we 'find in him for the first time a real communion of the soul with God.' Hertzberg's discriminating study is a real enrichment of our knowledge of Old Testament religion.

An admirably complete Hebrew Grammar² (in-

¹ *Prophet und Gott, eine Studie zur Religiosität des vorerilischen Prophetentums*, von Lic. H. W. Hertzberg (Verlag von Bertelsmann, Gütersloh: Mk. 5.50).

² *Grammaire de l'Hébreu Biblique*, par le P. Paul

cluding Syntax) has been written by Paul Joüon, S.J. The book is not so exhaustive as König's *Lehgebäude*, but both in bulk and in excellence it bears comparison with even the latest edition of Gesenius. The arrangement of the material is very lucid: illustrations, usually translated, abound; and while there is much that is familiar, there is also much that is fresh. Particularly full and interesting are the discussion of the tenses, and the suggested explanation of waw consecutive—that the imperfect had once two opposite meanings, according as it was accented on the first or second syllable: thus, *yāqum*, he will arise; *yāqom*, he arose. Unlike Sievers, he believes in the 'medial' *sh'wa*: thus he transliterates מַלְכִּי, *mal'kē*, remarking that 'this word has two syllables, though the syllabic division is impossible,' as it can be neither *ma-l'kē* nor *mal'-kē*. Despite the philological penetration of Joüon, many unsolved problems yet remain. More than once he confesses candidly that certain phenomena are difficult or impossible to explain satisfactorily. Among such problems are these—the vocalization of certain words as jussive where the sense calls for the indicative (Dt 28²¹ יִרְבֶּק; the *i* (if correct) in such a form as יוֹצֵא; the plur. of בֵּית; the *i* in בָּקֵר (from בָּקֵר); the choice of the tenses in poetry (sometimes possibly determined by metrical considerations); the virtual reduplication of the guttural in some forms, and its absence from others, within the same verb, e.g., impf. Pi. יִבְעַר, inf. Pi. בִּעַר; the forms בָּקֵר, בָּקַר, and בָּקָם with the *s'ghol*; the failure to retract the tone (וַיִּתֵּן) or to throw it forward (וַיִּקְטֹּל) contrary to the expectation raised by the general phonetic laws; etc. Of many grammatical phenomena in Hebrew we are still obliged to say what Joüon says of the *nun energicum*, that no fixed laws seem to govern them, and all we can do is to note the usages. Without solving every problem, Joüon has written a really attractive Grammar, well calculated to give students a thorough insight into the fundamental principles of the language.

A knowledge of Christian-Palestinian Aramaic throws much light on the language of Jesus and of the Gospels generally, but hitherto it has been hard to come by. It was represented by badly mutilated palimpsest fragments, and only in Joüon, S.J. (Institut Biblique Pontifical, Rome; 75 lire).

recent years have longer and better preserved palimpsests been discovered. These have been very carefully examined by F. Schulthess, who from them constructed a Grammar of that important dialect.¹ He died before the work was published, and it has been prepared for the press from the author's MS by Enno Littmann. The Grammar, which presupposes a knowledge of Syriac and Biblical Aramaic, is very complete, and marked throughout by the elaborate care which was to be expected from Schulthess, whom Littmann describes as beyond challenge our foremost authority. The Grammar is followed by extracts from the literature, both Biblical and extra-Biblical, for example, the homilies of Cyril; and this again is followed by a vocabulary, so that the book furnishes a complete apparatus for the mastery of the dialect. An excellent feature of the Grammar is that throughout the whole book all the Aramaic words are transcribed—a feature peculiarly welcome in a script without vowels.

A new volume on the Apostolic Fathers,² resting on the work of Funk, of which the second edition appeared in 1906, has just been issued by Professor Bihlmeyer. It contains the Didache, Barnabas, I. and II. Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias, Quadratus, and the Letter to Diognetus: the Shepherd of Hermas is reserved for a second volume. A beautifully printed Greek text, with all the more important variants relegated to the foot of the page, is preceded by succinct but pointed introductions, which discuss the place, time, purpose, and occasionally the style of the various compositions. The up-to-dateness of the discussion is shown by the fact that Dr. Bihlmeyer has made use of the recently discovered Coptic fragment of the Didache, which was only published in the spring of last year. These writings, which broadly aim at the instruction and edification of believers, whether through pastoral letters, apologetic, homily, or church manual, are second only to the New Testament as sources for our knowledge of the life and thought of the early Church, and they could not be studied to better advantage than in this

highly convenient edition, the value of which is enhanced by the addition of a Bibliography to each chapter.

A very valuable service is being rendered to students of Latin Christianity by Diehl's publication of ancient Latin Christian Inscriptions,³ three numbers of which have just appeared. The Inscriptions, which will number 4700, have been gathered from an immense material scattered throughout many volumes: they cover the period up to the beginning of the seventh century; they are drawn from the entire Roman world; and they have been selected with a view to their importance, considered from the point of view of their contents or language. There is rich material here, both in prose and in verse, for the student of ecclesiastical and secular history, but no less for the student of archaeology and philology. The Inscriptions, though each has its own importance, are of varying value: some are conventional, some rhetorical, many are touching, many reflect a simple and often passionate faith. In the subjects of these Inscriptions the whole official and unofficial life—civil and ecclesiastical—of the Empire passes before us—magistrates of the highest ranks and workers from the lowliest walks of society. In the poetical inscriptions there is many an echo of classical poetry; the brief Latin notes appended to each inscription call attention to these parallels. Much of the terse and epigrammatic vigour of classical Latin reappears here: e.g. in inscription 748 'felix vita viri, felicior exitus ipse,' or inscription 1195 'pauperibus dives, sed sibi pauper erat.' This undertaking can only be continued if a sufficient number of subscribers comes forward: it is earnestly to be hoped that so praiseworthy a scheme will receive the support which it deserves.

Two more numbers of the *Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge* are to hand.

Tillich⁴ deals with 'Church and Culture.' The Church and Society are ideally one; above and behind both is God, the ground of all reality. The Church must learn to express the truth committed

¹ *Grammatik des Christlich-Palästinischen Aramäisch*, von Friedrich Schulthess (Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen: geh. Mk. 9; geb. Mk. 11).

² *Die Apostolischen Väter*, von Karl Bihlmeyer (Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen: geh. Mk. 4.50; geb. Mk. 5.50).

³ *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres*, edidit Ernestus Diehl (Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, Berlin, S.W. 68; each number Mk. 3.75).

⁴ *Kirche und Kultur*, von Paul Tillich (Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen; Mk. 1).

to her through the symbols of art and culture, and in the expression of her distinctive life her deepest debt is to her great prophetic personalities.

Lenz¹ emphasizes the importance of recognizing the power of religion as a factor in social life,

¹ *Die Bedeutung des Protestantismus für den Aufbau einer allgemeinen Staatslehre*, von Dr Georg Lenz (Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen; Mk. 1).

and, in particular, the close connexion of religious dogmas with political ideas—a connexion which was much more clearly recognized in the period of the Reformation than to-day; and he summons Protestantism to a better appreciation of its task and of its potential influence.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

Contributions and Comments.

Colossians ii. 23.

THERE is a passage in the Epistle to the Colossians (2²³), which has been a constant difficulty to the translators, and which Professor Rendel Harris considerably relieved by an article in your issue of January 1923, pointing out that it contained a reference to the 'Clouds' of Aristophanes and to Socratic teaching. It curiously happens that the 'Clouds' supplies another key. St. Paul has been deprecating Socratic asceticism—'Touch not, taste not,' etc., and in the last words of the sentence writes that these things are *οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινὶ πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκός*. Reading the 'clouds' again, the keyword suggests itself irresistibly. Strepsiades has it much on his mind, and his repeated *ἐπιλήσμων* fits exactly into St. Paul's thought. He himself uses the word as a verb, 'forgetting the things that are behind'; and now he urges that asceticism 'is of no value to the forgetting of the flesh.' Maybe it is no chance that the 'Clouds' suggests the word. If St. Paul was thinking at all of this play he must have had before him poor Strepsiades and his 'forgetfulness.' This may also count as supporting Professor Rendel Harris's original argument that he had this play in his mind.

BERNARD G. HALL.

Knutsford.

Romans ii. 18.

Thou 'approvest the things that are more excellent.'—A.V.

Thou 'provest the things that differ.'—R.V. margin.

In this passage the R.V. simply omits the 'more' of the A.V., but as the marginal reading shows there is no reason to translate *δοκιμάζεις* as 'approvest' rather than 'provest.' The word is used in both senses elsewhere, and the same phrase recurs in the infinitive in Ph 1¹⁰. As Sanday and Headlam and Denney point out, there is a double ambiguity in the Greek, as *δοκιμάζειν* may mean (1) to distinguish, or (2) to approve after testing, while *τὰ διαφέροντα* may mean (1) things which differ, or (2) things which being proved are found to excel. It is pretty obvious that St. Paul does not mean to exclude either meaning of either word. He means both 'weighing' and 'deciding,' and 'things really different,' some better than others.

Dr. Moffatt paraphrases 'with a sense of what is vital in religion,' but this loses the sense of deliberation in *δοκιμάζειν*. Fortunately we have in English a word with a similar ambiguity, to 'appreciate,' which means both to distinguish and to approve or value after due deliberation. I suggest, therefore, as an exact translation: 'Thou dost appreciate real differences of value.'

W. R. FORRESTER.

Roslin.

Entre Nous.

The Speaker's Bible.

FIVE volumes have now been issued, and the sixth volume on *Job and Psalms* is ready (Speaker's Bible Office, Aberdeen; 10s. 6d. net). It would not be easy to select any of the reviews when all

have been so favourable, so we will quote the last two which have come to our hand. One of these happens to be a review of the fourth volume from the *Watchman Examiner* of New York:

'The fourth volume of this series of matchless

commentaries, edited by the world's famous Biblical and theological encyclopædist, covers the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. The three preceding volumes dealt with Hebrews (one volume), and the Gospel of Luke (two volumes). The name "Hastings" has been one with which to conjure. Its mention brings before our minds the picture of one of the most stimulating and suggestive periodicals in the English language; presents to us the greatest dictionary of the Bible, the greatest dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, the greatest dictionary of the Apostolic Church, the greatest encyclopædia of religion and ethics, as well as the choice volumes on the *Great Texts of the Bible*, *The Greater Men and Women of the Bible*, *The Children's Great Texts of the Bible*, and *The Great Christian Doctrines*. Surely these volumes were enough to make the name of any one man forever famous, but not content with these contributions, Dr Hastings sought to bring his life to a glorious climax by editing *The Speaker's Bible*. The minister who uses these volumes of *The Speaker's Bible* will find a new charm creeping into his pulpit messages, as all the best sermons, essays and other literature of all the ages will be made to contribute to the message in hand. We marvel at the inclusion of the cream of the latest books in these pages. We prize the latest volume so highly that it is scarcely ever on the shelf, being almost continually on our working table. We eagerly and anxiously await the coming of the other volumes of the set.

The *Scottish Congregationalist* commends the fifth volume in this way:

'The Speaker's Bible. Edited by James Hastings, D.D. First and Second Peter, and Epistle of Jude. It will be many years before anything will be published that will take the place of these volumes of the Speaker's Bible. For scholarship, insight, and suggestion there is nothing to equal them. It is an encyclopædia of thought and ideas on the leading texts of the books dealt with, and enriched by telling illustrations drawn from many fields, and illuminated by the poets. It is an amazing piece of work. But Dr. Hastings was an amazing worker. For the ordinary work of the pulpit the average preacher would be well advised to spend his money on these volumes rather than on Commentaries. The introduction discusses the authorship of the Epistle, where it was written, and to whom, and when and why it was written. The introduction to Jude deals with the characteristics of the letter, who were

the heretics against whom the writer warns, and who the writer was.'

Bound volumes may be had either direct from the Speaker's Bible Office, Aberdeen, or through the booksellers. There is also a serial issue at 2s. per month, or 11s. for a half-yearly subscription.

The Peace of Self-Control.

Those who have not read Stopford Brooke's Sermons should certainly get his daughter's selections from them. She gives the volume the title *Die to Live* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). Her husband, Dr. L. P. Jacks, has written a foreword. Towards the end of it he speaks of those who knew Stopford Brooke as 'now a diminishing band.' Stopford Brooke's message is such a living one for to-day, it is hard to realize how many years it is since his human voice was stilled. Here, on the 'Peace of Self-Control,' he might well be speaking to the restlessness of 1925:

'In how many of our lives is there any temperance at all? Or any desire to work for it? Who among us realizes, before we plunge into some excitement, or into any unbridled thinking of ourselves, the meaning of that image of Giotto—where the noble Virtue of Temperance stands binding the hilt of her sword to the scabbard, lest she should draw it too quickly, even when she is righteously distempered? Who, when a wild desire cries for satisfaction, has the habit of turning it out of doors? Who, when life is dull, and a fresh pleasure offers itself, restrains himself until clear answers are given to these questions—"Is this right in the eyes of Love? Will it sow sorrow in some soul, or disturb some life?" It is wise, even at the risk of checking noble impulse, to ask these questions now, when self-indulgence is so much the mistress of society, or the mistress of our own lonely, self-devouring heart. It is wiser now, in this life of doing or thinking our own pleasure, to make self-control, for love's sake, the governor of the soul. For the want of this temperance is the curse of modern life. Men and women cry for peace, but they will take no trouble for it. They will renounce nothing. Peace will only be ours when we have mastered self-desires for the sake of love; when in temperate government of the soul by One Law of Love, we have won the self-forgetfulness of Jesus Christ. Then the soul, having unity in its diversity, having passion subdued to whiteness by self-control, having power because all its qualities radiate to one point where

burns the Love of God for man His child—has Peace within, deep as the seas of eternity.'

NEW POETRY.

In November Mr. A. A. Milne's volume of delightful children's poems was first issued in book form. The same month a second edition was required, and in December there appeared the third, fourth, and fifth editions—*When We were Very Young* (Methuen; 7s. 6d. net). The illustrations are by Mr. Ernest H. Shepard, and they are as delightful as the poems :

VESPERS

*Little Boy kneels at the foot of the bed,
Droops on the little hands, little gold head.
Hush! Hush! Whisper who dares!
Christopher Robin is saying his prayers.*

God bless Mummy. I know that's right.
Wasn't it fun in the bath to-night?
The cold's so cold, and the hot's so hot.
Oh! *God bless Daddy*—I quite forgot.

If I open my fingers a little bit more,
I can see Nanny's dressing-gown on the door.
It's a beautiful blue, but it hasn't a hood.
Oh! *God bless Nanny, and make her good.*

Mine has a hood, and I lie in bed,
And pull the hood right over my head,
And I shut my eyes, and I curl up small,
And nobody knows that I'm there at all.

Oh! *Thank you, God, for a lovely day,*
And what was the other I had to say?
I said, "Bless Daddy," so what can it be?
Oh! Now I remember it. *God bless Me.*

*Little Boy kneels at the foot of the bed,
Droops on the little hands, little gold head.
Hush! Hush! Whisper who dares!
Christopher Robin is saying his prayers.*

Orde Ward.

Out of the very large number of poems written by the Rev. F. W. Orde Ward, a number have been selected by his daughter, and published by the Swarthmore Press (5s. net).

The title of the volume is simply *Selected Poems of F. W. Orde Ward*. The volume contains also a short account of Mr. Ward's life from the time when he became Vicar of Pishill in 1883 until his death

in 1922. The poems are very varied in subject. We quote one of the religious poems :

THE FOOLISHNESS OF GOD IS WISER THAN MEN (1 Cor. i. 25).

Dear Father, all the wisdoms vain
Of all the ages are but dross,
And idle work and weary pain,
Before the Wisdom of the Cross;
For now even death is made Divine,
And wonderful it is to see—
That this sweet Foolishness of Thine
Doth win so many hearts to Thee.

We build great arguments on high,
Babels of thought like lofty towers,
To bring Eternity more nigh
And mimic thus Thy God-like Powers:
But as in empty pride they stand,
They pass like breath upon the breeze
And perish—for, O Lord, Thy grand
Simplicity is more than these.

Ah, teach me then the better lore,
And let me thus unlearn the old,
Till with the instructions in Thy store
I shall be very wise and bold;
And may the Knowledge that is Life
Show me the Cross alone can bless,
And he who loses in the strife
Is Conqueror in Thy Foolishness.

Carey Bonner.

It is not easy to select either prose or poetry. The Rev. Carey Bonner has shown a nice and assured discrimination in the *Devotional Meditations* and Poems in his new volume for use in the 'Quiet Hour.' The title of the volume is *Up to the Hills* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). The passages are undated, but the book is planned in weekly sections. This is the selection for one day:

'How manifest is this kinship of life in the time of spring! Brother Lawrence—the seventeenth-century saint of Lorraine—received this "singular favour" of God, in that he was converted, at the age of eighteen, by seeing a tree in winter, and considering that, in the closely approaching spring, it would be bursting into new life. The fact of God flashed upon his soul, and remained clear and vivid throughout his life. "My God," he cried, "Thou canst make me also to live."

'Why should that be "singular"? Is not this the marvel, that there are so few such cases! What are the trees but Evangelists of God? 'Tis only

the blindness and deafness of the congregation that accounts for the lack of conversions.

'I would crave the insight of the Wiltshire peasant in Miss Bunston's poem:

UNDER A WILTSHIRE APPLE-TREE.

Some folks as can afford,
So I've heard say,
Sets up a sort of cross
Right in the garden way
To mind 'em of the Lord.

But I, when I do see
Thik apple tree
An' stoopin' limb
All spread wi' moss,
I think of Him
And how He talks wi' me.

I think of God
And how He trod
That garden long ago;
He walked, I reckon, to and fro
And then sat down
Upon the groun'
Or some low limb
What suited Him.
Such as you see
On many a tree,
And on thik very one
Where I at set o' sun
Do sit and talk wi' He.

And, mornings too, I rise and 'come
An' sit down where the branch be low;
A bird do sing, a bee do hum,
The flowers in the border blow.
And all my heart's so glad and clear
As pools when mists do disappear:
As pools a-laughing in the light
When morning air is swep' an' bright,
As pools what got all Heaven in sight,
So's my heart's Cheer
When He be near.

He never pushes the garden door,
He left no footmark on the floor;
I never heard 'Un stir nor tread
And yet His hand do bless my head,
And when 'tis time for work to start
I takes Him with me in my heart.

And when I die, pray God I see
At very last thik apple-tree
An' stooping limb,
And think of Him
And all He been to me.'

ANNA BUNSTON.

A TEXT.

Mark x. 32.

What is the supreme moment of our Lord's ministry? The Rev. James Black, D.D., says that it took place outside Jericho, 'And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus went before them: and they were amazed; and as they followed, they were afraid. And he took again the twelve, and began to tell them what things should happen unto him.'

Some amazing thing happened. As Jesus strode out in front, these disciples, for the only time in their lives, were stricken with sudden panic.

'What accounts for it? It must have been something in Jesus—some sign of agony, some mark of uncontrollable emotion, some drawn look—that startled these loving hearts. I have no doubt that His face became fixed and drawn. I have no doubt that He evidenced emotion. . . . After a moment or two, having relaxed from His overmastering feelings, He turned back to His astonished disciples, and said quietly: "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem." Here, on this bit of white road outside Jericho, He had finally decided to go to Jerusalem, knowing what it meant.

'When you think of it, a man's greatest agony always lies in his deciding. Just to know what to do, amid the balancing of "Pros" and "Cons," in the wrangle of possibilities, with the fear of false decision, with the haunting horror of a fatal foolish step, just to make your mind up finally to face some dreadful thing, that is always a soul's greatest agony.

'Any of us who has been faced with some momentous decision knows the agony of this moment. When one's whole life hangs on a single act, the decision is compressed passion. There may be people who jest about their decisions, or who can shut their eyes and leap; but these are not people who look at life seriously. Where there is a soul like Jesus, faced with issues like Jesus, the decision is an agony of perplexity.

'On the other hand, once the mind is bent and the die is finally cast, a man may quietly face anything.'

This incident Dr. Black calls the 'Dilemma of the Cross-Roads.' At the morning service at St. George's, Edinburgh, he has been dealing with the Dilemmas of Jesus, and he finds that they were twelve in number. His treatment in every case is suggestive. The sermons have now been published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton—*The Dilemmas of Jesus* (7s. 6d. net).

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.